

LPTENS-99/54
 hep-th/9912089
 December 1999

Integrable structures in classical off-shell 10D supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory

Jean-Loup GERVAIS
 and
 Henning SAMTLEBEN¹

Laboratoire de Physique Théorique de l'École Normale Supérieure,²
 24 rue Lhomond, 75231 Paris CÉDEX 05, France.

Abstract

The superspace flatness conditions which are equivalent to the field equations of supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory in ten dimensions have not been useful so far to derive non trivial classical solutions. Recently, modified flatness conditions were proposed, which are explicitly integrable [10], and are based on the breaking of symmetry $SO(9,1) \rightarrow SO(2,1) \otimes SO(7)$. In this article, we investigate their physical content. To this end, group-algebraic methods are developed which allow to derive the set of physical fields and their equations of motion from the superfield expansion of the supercurl, systematically.

A set of integrable superspace constraints is identified which drastically reduces the field content of the unconstrained superfield but leaves the spectrum including the original Yang-Mills vector field completely off-shell. A weaker set of constraints gives rise to additional fields obeying first order differential equations. Geometrically, the $SO(7)$ covariant superspace constraints descend from a truncation of Witten's original linear system to particular one-parameter families of light-like rays.

¹Supported by EU contract ERBFMRX-CT96-0012.

²UMR 8548: Unité Mixte du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, et de l'École Normale Supérieure.

Contents

1	Introduction.	2
2	Superspace constraints and Lax representation.	4
2.1	Superfield conventions	4
2.2	Superspace constraints	6
2.3	Lax representations	8
3	Systematics of the supercurl expansion.	11
3.1	Algebraic structure of the recursion gauge condition	12
3.2	Extracting dynamics from the superspace constraints	16
4	The physical field content.	18
4.1	Decomposition into $SO(2, 1)$ representations	19
4.2	The reduced integrable constraint	21
4.3	The integrable constraint	23
5	Recurrent relations.	24
5.1	The reduced integrable constraint	25
5.2	The integrable constraint	26
6	Field equations.	28
6.1	The reduced integrable constraint	30
6.2	The integrable constraint	30
7	Summary	33
A	Reduction of σ-matrices.	35
B	The $O(9, 1)$ characters.	36
B.1	The unconstrained character.	36
B.2	The character corresponding to $\mathcal{M}^\pm$	37
C	Group decomposition of superfields.	38

1 Introduction.

Recently, progress was made in applying exact integration methods to supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory in ten dimensions starting from the flatness conditions in superspace which have been known for some time to be equivalent to the field equations [14, 19]. It was shown in [10], that there exists an on-shell light cone gauge, where the superfields may be entirely expressed in terms of a scalar superfield satisfying two sets of equations. The first is linear and the general solution was derived; the second is similar to Yang's equations and has been handled by methods similar to earlier studies of self-dual Yang-Mills in four dimensions. A general class of exact solutions³ has been obtained [10] and a Bäcklund transformation put forward [7].

So far, however, it has not been possible to simultaneously solve the two sets of equations. Only a particular class of solutions of the Yang type equations has been found, which is not general enough to solve the other (linear) set. Returning to a general gauge, one may see that deriving the scalar superfield satisfying the linear subset of equations is equivalent [7] to solving a particular symmetrized form of the flatness conditions. This symmetrized form was shown to be explicitly integrable directly, since it arises [8, 9] as compatibility condition of a Lax representation, similar to the one of Belavin and Zakharov [2], which may be handled by the same powerful techniques as in the case of self-dual Yang-Mills in four dimensions.

The goal of this article is a systematic study of these integrable modifications of the original flatness conditions in superspace. We shall refer to them as the *integrable* superspace constraint – as opposed to the *strong* superspace constraint which describes vanishing of the full super field strength and is equivalent to the Yang-Mills system. Since the proof of this equivalence is recursive and rather tedious [14, 19, 12, 1], a priori it is not clear which modification of the field content and dynamics is implied by a modification of the strong superspace constraint.

An important property of the integrable superspace constraint is that it explicitly breaks the original $SO(9, 1)$ Lorentz symmetry down to $SO(2, 1) \times SO(7)$. For Weyl-Majorana spinors and in particular the Grassmann coordinates in superspace, this leads to the separation $\mathbf{16} \rightarrow \mathbf{8} + \mathbf{8}$, (where the

³keeping, however, only the dependence upon one time and one space coordinates in contrast with the dimensional reduction which will be discussed below. This is probably not essential.

r.h.s. denotes a pair of $SO(7)$ spinor representations which form a doublet under $SO(2, 1)$). This is instrumental in defining the involution which is the key to applying methods modeled over the bosonic self-duality requirement in four dimensions; here, the analogous construction involves the exchange of the two spinor representations.

In the rest of the paper we concentrate upon deriving the field content and dynamical equations induced by the integrable superspace constraint. Since this constraint is weaker than the original (strong) superspace constraint, we effectively go partially off-shell. There are more physical fields in the superfield components and the dynamics is modified. At this point, it is worth recalling that, in the standard treatment [12, 1], the method used to eliminate the unphysical components of the superfields makes an essential use of the equations of motion. It is thus not applicable to our case. One of the aims of the present work is to devise a more direct and general method, which is also applicable to our modified equations.

After reviewing superspace notations, in section 2 we introduce the original (strong) and the modified (integrable) superspace constraints. We explain the geometrical origin of the integrable superspace constraint as particular truncation of the Lax representation in superspace [19]. This original Lax representation, associated with the strong superspace constraint, is formulated for light-like rays in ten dimensions, which play the role of spectral parameters. Restricting the connection to certain one-parameter families of light rays (spanning a three-manifold) makes the system accessible to the techniques developed in [2] for four-dimensional self-dual Yang-Mills theory. With a particular choice of three-manifold, this gives back the integrable superspace constraint. For the subsequent analysis it is helpful to further introduce a slightly stronger version of this constraint corresponding to an effective reduction of the Lax representation to seven dimensions and referred to as the *reduced integrable* constraint. Due to the fact that this reduced constraint commutes with the action of the symmetric group on spinor indices, it eventually turns out to be completely soluble, which essentially simplifies the analysis of the integrable constraint.

The rest of the paper is devoted to studying field content and dynamics induced by the integrable and the reduced integrable superspace constraints. Section 3 presents a systematic general study of the expansion of the superfield equations in powers of the odd variables θ . We derive recursion relations with an interesting structure. The elimination of unphysical components of

superfields is done recursively and involves two operators noted S and T . The first satisfies a simple quadratic equation while the second is nilpotent. Thus our equations bear some analogy with the descent equations [20]. The field equations are enforced by further applying a projector K , and we thus study the interplay between S , T , and K on general ground.

Applying this method to the integrable superspace constraints, in section 4, we explicitly identify the induced physical field content. As a result, we find a spectrum which is essentially larger than the original Yang-Mills system. For the reduced integrable constraint it consists of $384+384$ fields which correspond to three copies of the ten-dimensional off-shell multiplet [3]; the integrable constraint then gives rise to additional $31+16$ fields. Section 5 is devoted to deriving explicit recurrent relations which determine the higher order superfield components in terms of these fields.

Finally, in section 6 we derive the field equations which are induced by the superspace constraints. The spectrum associated with the reduced integrable constraint remains completely off-shell, whereas the additional fields appearing with the integrable constraint satisfy a set of first order differential equations. A discussion of this dynamics and some concluding remarks are given at the end.

2 Superspace constraints and Lax representation.

2.1 Superfield conventions

The notations are essentially the same as in the previous references. The physical fields are noted as follows: $X_a(\underline{x})$ is the vector potential, $\phi^\alpha(\underline{x})$ is the Majorana-Weyl spinor. Both are matrices in the adjoint representation of the gauge group $\mathbf{G}$. Latin indices $a = 0, \dots, 9$ describe Minkowski components, Greek indices $\alpha = 1, \dots, 16$ denote spinor components. We use the Dirac matrices

$$\Gamma^a = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{16 \times 16} & ((\sigma^a)^{\alpha\beta}) \\ ((\sigma^a)_{\alpha\beta}) & 0_{16 \times 16} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Gamma^{11} = \begin{pmatrix} 1_{16 \times 16} & 0 \\ 0 & -1_{16 \times 16} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.1)$$

We will use the superspace formulation with 16 odd coordinates θ^α . The general superfield expansions of a superfield $\Phi(\underline{x}, \underline{\theta})$ may be written as

$$\Phi(\underline{x}, \underline{\theta}) = \sum_{p=0}^{16} \Phi^{[p]}(\underline{x}, \underline{\theta}) \equiv \sum_{p=0}^{16} \sum_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_p} \frac{\theta^{\alpha_1} \dots \theta^{\alpha_p}}{p!} \Phi_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_p}^{[p]}(\underline{x}) . \quad (2.2)$$

The grading is given by the operator

$$\mathcal{R} = \theta^\alpha \partial_\alpha , \quad [\mathcal{R}, \Phi^{[p]}] = p \Phi^{[p]} . \quad (2.3)$$

Superderivatives are defined by

$$D_\alpha = \partial_\alpha - \theta^\beta (\sigma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a , \quad \text{such that} \quad [D_\alpha, D_\beta]_+ = -2 (\sigma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a . \quad (2.4)$$

The odd super vector potential, valued in the adjoint representation of the gauge group, is denoted by $A_\alpha(\underline{x}, \underline{\theta})$. We define its supercurl $M_{\alpha\beta}$ as

$$M_{\alpha\beta} \equiv D_\alpha A_\beta + D_\beta A_\alpha + [A_\alpha, A_\beta]_+ \equiv F_{\alpha\beta} - 2 (\sigma^a)_{\alpha\beta} A_a , \quad (2.5)$$

$$A_a \equiv -\frac{1}{32} (\sigma_a)^{\alpha\beta} M_{\alpha\beta} . \quad (2.6)$$

This gives the decomposition of the supercurl into the super field strength $F_{\alpha\beta}$ and the even vector potential $A_a(\underline{x}, \underline{\theta})$ as functions of A_α .⁴ The superfield formalism is invariant under gauge transformations

$$\begin{aligned} A_\alpha &\mapsto g^{-1} A_\alpha g + g^{-1} D_\alpha g , \\ F_{\alpha\beta} &\mapsto g^{-1} F_{\alpha\beta} g , \\ A_a &\mapsto g^{-1} A_a g + g^{-1} \partial_a g , \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

with an even superfield $g(\underline{x}, \underline{\theta})$ as gauge parameter. Imposing the so-called recursion gauge condition

$$\theta^\alpha A_\alpha = 0 \quad (2.8)$$

restricts the freedom (2.7) to ordinary gauge freedom, i.e. to gauge parameters g with $[\mathcal{R}, g] = 0$.

⁴In the terminology of [15], we have hence resolved the ‘‘conventional constraint’’ $(\sigma_a)^{\alpha\beta} F_{\alpha\beta} = 0$.

2.2 Superspace constraints

It is known that the equations of motion of super Yang Mills theory in ten dimensions may equivalently be expressed as vanishing of the super curvature

$$F_{\alpha\beta} = 0 . \quad (2.9)$$

More precisely, it has been shown in [14, 19, 12, 1] that the recursion gauge condition (2.8) together with the flatness conditions (2.9) implies the Yang-Mills equations of motion

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^a F_{ab} + [A^a, F_{ab}] &= \frac{1}{2} (\sigma_b)_{\alpha\beta} [\chi^\alpha, \chi^\beta] \\ (\sigma^a)_{\alpha\beta} (\partial_a \chi^\beta + [A_a, \chi^\beta]) &= 0 , \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

for the superfields A_a and χ^α , the latter being defined as $\chi^\alpha \equiv (\sigma^a)^{\alpha\beta} F_{a\beta}$ with the curvature

$$F_{a\beta} \equiv (D_\beta A_a - \partial_a A_\beta + [A_\beta, A_a]) . \quad (2.11)$$

Moreover, (2.8) and (2.9) yield a unique recurrent prescription of the higher order superfield components in A_a , χ^α and A_α as functions of the zero order contributions

$$X_a \equiv A_a^{[0]} , \quad \phi^\alpha \equiv \chi^{\alpha[0]} , \quad (2.12)$$

These zero order components in particular satisfy the usual supersymmetric Yang-Mills equations of motion.

For the purpose of this paper we rewrite the vanishing super curvature condition (2.9) in terms of the supercurl $M_{\alpha\beta}$. It is convenient to introduce the general space of superfields symmetric in two additional spinor indices $(\alpha\beta)$, which we denote by $\mathcal{M}$. This space carries the grading (2.2):

$$\mathcal{M} = \bigoplus_{p=0}^{16} \mathcal{M}^{[p]} \equiv \bigoplus_{p=0}^{16} \{ v_{(\alpha\beta), [\gamma_1 \dots \gamma_p]} \theta^{\gamma_1} \dots \theta^{\gamma_p} \} . \quad (2.13)$$

and its elements have the general decomposition according to

$$\underbrace{M_{\alpha\beta}}_{(16 \times 16)_s} = \underbrace{-2 (\sigma^a)_{\alpha\beta} A_a}_{10} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{5!} (\sigma^{a_1 \dots a_5})_{\alpha\beta} B_{a_1 \dots a_5}}_{126} , \quad (2.14)$$

with selfdual $B_{a_1\dots a_5} = -\frac{1}{5!} \epsilon_{a_1\dots a_{10}} B^{a_6\dots a_{10}}$. In terms of this decomposition, the superspace constraint (2.9) corresponds to setting $B_{a_1\dots a_5} = 0$ and may be written as a projection condition K_{YM} on the supercurl

$$M_{\alpha\beta} = (K_{\text{YM}} M)_{\alpha\beta} , \quad (2.15)$$

$$\text{with } (K_{\text{YM}})_{\alpha\beta}^{\alpha'\beta'} = \frac{1}{16} (\sigma^a)_{\alpha\beta} (\sigma_a)^{\alpha'\beta'} ,$$

This paper is devoted to a study of other (weaker) superfield constraints which replace (2.15) and have appeared as completely integrable superfield equations in [8, 9]. Obviously, (2.15) is the only $SO(9, 1)$ covariant constraint that can be imposed on the supercurl. We hence break the original $SO(9, 1)$ Lorentz invariance of the system down to $SO(2, 1) \times SO(7)$; the reason for this particular choice will become clear the following. It is in this setting that the modified constraints have appeared in [10, 8, 9].

For Weyl-Majorana spinors, this symmetry breaking leads to the separation

$$\mathbf{16} \rightarrow (\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{8}) : \quad \chi^\alpha \mapsto (\chi^\mu, \chi^{\bar{\mu}}) , \quad \mu, \bar{\mu} = 1, \dots, 8 , \quad (2.16)$$

where the r.h.s. denotes a pair of $SO(7)$ spinor representations which form a doublet under $SO(2, 1)$ such that $\mu \leftrightarrow \bar{\mu}$ denotes the $SO(7)$ invariant involution. In appendix A we have collected the conventions about decomposing the $SO(9, 1)$ σ -matrices into $SO(8)$ γ -matrices.

The supercurl $M_{\alpha\beta}$ correspondingly decomposes into

$$M_{\alpha\beta} = \mathbf{10} + \mathbf{126} \mapsto (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1}) + (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{7}) + (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{21}) + (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{35}) \quad (2.17)$$

The superspace constraints which we are going to study in this paper are the following projections

$$K_{\text{YM}} : \quad M_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1}) + (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{7}) \quad (2.18)$$

$$K_{\text{I}} : \quad M_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1}) + (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{7}) + (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{21}) \quad (2.19)$$

$$K_{\text{IR}} : \quad M_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{7}) + (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{21}) \quad (2.20)$$

The first constraint is the original vanishing super curvature condition (2.15) which corresponds to the Yang-Mills system. The latter two constraints have appeared in [8, 9] as compatibility equations of completely integrable Lax representations. We will refer to them as to the integrable and the reduced

integrable constraint, respectively. Note, that the truncation (2.20) is gauge covariant only after dimensional reduction of the system to seven dimensions.

Before analyzing the field content and dynamics implied by these superfield constraints we first recall how they may be obtained as compatibility equations of Lax representations in superspace.

2.3 Lax representations

In this section we recall the original linear system [19] associated with the vanishing curvature condition (2.18), and show how the integrable constraints (2.19), (2.20) may be obtained as certain truncations thereof.

The flatness conditions (2.9), (2.18) possess a Lax type representation in superspace [19]. They imply the existence of a $\mathbf{G}$ -valued superfield $\Psi[\underline{\ell}]$ for any light-like ten-dimensional vector $\underline{\ell}$, which is defined by the linear system

$$\begin{aligned}\ell^a (\sigma_a)^{\alpha\beta} \{D_\beta + A_\beta\} \Psi[\underline{\ell}] &= 0, \\ \ell^a \{\partial_a - A_a\} \Psi[\underline{\ell}] &= 0.\end{aligned}\tag{2.21}$$

In turn, the compatibility conditions of (2.21) imply (2.9). Clearly, these equations are invariant under multiplication by an overall constant, so that Ψ only depends upon the light-like ray considered.

Equations (2.21) may be considered as a Lax representation of the field equations (2.10) where the light-like vector $\underline{\ell}$ plays the role of the spectral parameter. As they stand, however, they have not been very useful in practice, i.e. with regard to the powerful solution generating methods applicable in lower dimensional systems. The constraints (2.19) and (2.20), in contrast, are derivable from a Lax representation where the spectral parameter is a complex number λ instead of a light ray, such that methods inspired from Ref. [2] become applicable [9, 7]. Starting from equations (2.21), the integrable constraints geometrically correspond to keeping only the flatness conditions associated with a particular one parameter subset $\underline{\ell}(\lambda)$ of light-like rays.

Breaking the original $SO(9,1)$ invariance we introduce the following parametrization for light-like rays $\ell = \ell(\lambda, \vec{v})$:

$$\ell^\pm = \pm i \frac{1 \mp \lambda}{1 \pm \lambda}, \quad \ell^i = v^i, \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, 8, \quad \ell^\pm \equiv \ell^0 \pm \ell^9, \tag{2.22}$$

with a complex number λ and an eight-dimensional unit vector v^i . The vector v^i provides a mapping between the two spinor representations of $SO(8)$ via $\gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{\vec{v}} = \vec{v} \cdot \vec{\gamma}_{\mu\bar{\nu}}$ (cf. appendix A).

The linear system (2.21) then takes the form

$$\left\{ \Delta_{\mu}^{\vec{v}} + B_{\mu}^{\vec{v}} + \lambda(\overline{\Delta}_{\mu}^{\vec{v}} + \overline{B}_{\mu}^{\vec{v}}) \right\} \Psi[\lambda, \vec{v}] = 0, \quad (2.23)$$

$$\left\{ \frac{1-\lambda}{1+\lambda} (\partial_+ + A_+) - \frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda} (\partial_- + A_-) - i \vec{v} \cdot (\vec{\partial} + \vec{A}) \right\} \Psi[\lambda, \vec{v}] = 0,$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\mu}^{\vec{v}} &= D_{\mu} + i \gamma_{\mu\bar{\rho}}^{\vec{v}} D_{\bar{\rho}}, & \overline{\Delta}_{\mu}^{\vec{v}} &= D_{\mu} - i \gamma_{\mu\bar{\rho}}^{\vec{v}} D_{\bar{\rho}}, \\ B_{\mu}^{\vec{v}} &= A_{\mu} + i \gamma_{\mu\bar{\rho}}^{\vec{v}} A_{\bar{\rho}}, & \overline{B}_{\mu}^{\vec{v}} &= A_{\mu} - i \gamma_{\mu\bar{\rho}}^{\vec{v}} A_{\bar{\rho}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.24)$$

We are now going to show, that the superspace constraints (2.18), (2.19), and (2.20) arise as compatibility equations of certain truncations of (2.23):

$$\begin{aligned} K_{\text{YM}} : & \quad \text{impose (2.23) for all vectors } \vec{v} \\ K_{\text{I}} : & \quad \text{impose (2.23) for a fixed vector } \vec{v} \\ K_{\text{IR}} : & \quad \text{impose (2.23) for a fixed vector } \vec{v} \\ & \quad \text{and reduce the linear system to seven dimensions} \end{aligned} \quad (2.25)$$

The first relation is the result of [19] and follows from computing the commutator of the Lax connection (2.23) with itself, thereby implying

$$(1+\lambda)^2 F_{\mu\nu} - (1-\lambda)^2 \gamma_{\mu\bar{\mu}}^{\vec{v}} \gamma_{\nu\bar{\nu}}^{\vec{v}} F_{\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}} + i(1-\lambda^2) (\gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{\vec{v}} F_{\nu\bar{\nu}} + \gamma_{\nu\bar{\mu}}^{\vec{v}} F_{\mu\bar{\mu}}) = 0$$

for all values of λ and $\vec{v}$ and hence vanishing of the supercurvature (2.9).

For a fixed choice of the vector $\vec{v}$ on the other hand, these conditions imply

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\mu\nu} &= 4 \delta_{\mu\nu} A_+ = \frac{1}{8} \delta_{\mu\nu} \delta^{\mu'\nu'} M_{\mu'\nu'}, \\ M_{\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}} &= 4 \delta_{\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}} A_- = \frac{1}{8} \delta_{\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}} \delta^{\bar{\mu}'\bar{\nu}'} M_{\bar{\mu}'\bar{\nu}'}, \\ (\gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{\vec{v}} M_{\nu\bar{\nu}} + \gamma_{\nu\bar{\mu}}^{\vec{v}} M_{\mu\bar{\mu}}) &= -2 \delta_{\mu\nu} \vec{v} \cdot \vec{A} = \frac{1}{4} \delta_{\mu\nu} \gamma^{\vec{v}}{}^{\mu'\bar{\nu}'} M_{\mu'\bar{\nu}'}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

This precisely corresponds to the projection (2.19). If furthermore we assume independence of the solution Ψ of the Lax pair (2.23) of the three coordinates

$$\partial_{\pm}\Psi = 0 = \vec{v}\cdot\vec{\partial}\Psi , \quad (2.27)$$

the second equation of (2.23) shows that

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\pm} &= \Psi \partial_{\pm}\Psi^{-1}\Big|_{\lambda=\mp 1} = 0 , \\ \vec{v}\cdot\vec{A} &= \Psi (\vec{v}\cdot\vec{\partial} + i\partial_9)\Psi^{-1}\Big|_{\lambda=0} - iA_9 = 0 . \end{aligned} \quad (2.28)$$

Together with (2.26), this implies the following stronger truncation on the supercurl

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\mu\nu} &= 0 , \\ M_{\overline{\mu}\overline{\nu}} &= 0 , \\ (\gamma_{\mu\overline{\nu}}^{\vec{v}}M_{\nu\overline{\nu}} + \gamma_{\nu\overline{\mu}}^{\vec{v}}M_{\mu\overline{\mu}}) &= 0 , \end{aligned} \quad (2.29)$$

corresponding to the projection (2.20). This finishes the proof of (2.25). We have hence shown, that the superspace constraints (2.19) and (2.20) arise as integrability conditions of the Lax pair (2.23) upon truncating the spectral parameter to a particular one parameter family of light-like rays.

The advantage of the reduced Lax connection comes from the fact that for fixed choice of $\vec{v}$, the linear system (2.23) is similar to the one proposed by Belavin and Zakharov for four-dimensional self-dual Yang-Mills theory [2] and similar techniques may successfully be applied. The role of the involution which in that case describes self-duality is played by exchanging the two $SO(8)$ spinor representations by means of $\vec{v}\cdot\vec{\gamma}_{\mu\overline{\rho}}$, here. This explains the particular choice of breaking the original Lorentz symmetry down to $SO(9,1) \rightarrow SO(2,1) \times SO(7)$. Upon this reduction, the system (2.23) may be solved starting from an ansatz which is meromorphic in λ . This leads to purely algebraic equations – coming from the fact that the bracket in equation (2.23) is linear in λ – which may be solved in essentially the same way as was done for the self-dual Yang-Mills theory. In this sense, the constraints (2.19) and (2.20) arise as completely integrable superfield equations.

In contrast, it seems impossible to carry out the next step and solve the system for all $\vec{v}$, which would really give a solution of the full Yang-Mills

equations in ten dimensions. Indeed, equation (2.24) implies that the bracket in (2.23) should be linear in $\vec{v} \cdot \vec{\gamma}$, a very strong requirement, which to satisfy there seems to exist no systematic method.

The situation further simplifies upon dropping the coordinate dependence according to (2.27). It should be noted that this is a natural but stronger requirement than solely restricting the coordinate dependence of the superfield components of $M_{\alpha\beta}$ (cf. [4] for a discussion of the reduction to four dimensions). With the original linear system (2.21) for example, dimensionally reduced physical configurations generically induce functions Ψ which still depend on the compactified coordinates. Restricting to dimensionally reduced functions Ψ corresponds to imposing further superfield constraints (2.29).

Relaxing the original superspace constraints however corresponds to going partially off-shell and gives rise to additional fields appearing in the higher order superfield components. Our goal in the following is to extract the field and the dynamical content associated with the integrable subset of superspace constraints.

3 Systematics of the supercurl expansion.

In the following, we study the purely algebraic problem to determine the field and dynamical content, induced by imposing the constraints (2.18)–(2.20) on the superfields. To this end, we first review the level structure of the superfields and show how to systematically extract field content and equations.

For the original set of constraints (2.26) this has been discussed in detail in [12, 1] (and likewise in [11] for the reduction to $N = 3$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory in four dimensions). However, this discussion makes an essential use of the Yang-Mills field equations, and thus does not apply to our case. The purpose of this paper is to present an alternative method. As central object we consider the supercurl $M_{\alpha\beta}$.

3.1 Algebraic structure of the recursion gauge condition

If we do not impose any constraint on the superfields, we simply have to take into account the fact that the gauge freedom (2.7) has been fixed by the recursion gauge condition (2.8) to gauge parameters which do not have higher order superfield components. For the components of the super vector potential this implies

$$\theta^\alpha A_\alpha = 0 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad A_{[\alpha, \gamma_1 \dots \gamma_p]}^{[p]} = 0, \quad (3.1)$$

which is still invariant under ordinary gauge transformations.

This shows that the independent components in the superfield A_α are given by the following sum of Young diagrams⁵ for the spinor representation **16** of $SO(9, 1)$

$$A_\alpha^{[1]} + A_\alpha^{[2]} + A_\alpha^{[3]} + \dots + \left\{ \begin{array}{c} A_\alpha^{[p]} \\ \vdots \\ \square \end{array} \right\} + \dots \quad (3.2)$$

Recurrence relations Since later on we are going to study the field equations implied by further constraining the supercurl $M_{\alpha\beta}$, we first identify the remaining independent field components in $M_{\alpha\beta}$ after imposing the recursion gauge condition. Equation (3.1) yields

$$(1 + \mathcal{R}) A_\alpha = \theta^\beta M_{\alpha\beta} \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad A_\alpha^{[p+1]} = \frac{1}{p+2} \theta^\gamma M_{\alpha\gamma}^{[p]}. \quad (3.3)$$

⁵Here, and in the following, the notion of Young diagrams always refers to (anti)symmetrizing the factors of a tensor product $V^{\otimes N}$ of a given representation V , i.e. always to the Young diagrams of the corresponding permutation group $\mathfrak{S}_N$.

At order p we get from (2.5)

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\alpha\beta}^{[p]} &= \partial_\alpha A_\beta^{[p+1]} + \partial_\beta A_\alpha^{[p+1]} \\ &\quad - (\sigma^m)_{\alpha\gamma} \theta^\gamma \partial_m A_\beta^{[p-1]} - (\sigma^m)_{\beta\gamma} \theta^\gamma \partial_m A_\alpha^{[p-1]} + \sum_{q=1}^{p-1} \left[A_\alpha^{[q]}, A_\beta^{[p-q]} \right]_+ \end{aligned}$$

Using (3.3) we may then re-express this relation entirely in terms of $M_{\alpha\beta}$. It is convenient to write it in the form

$$(S + \mathcal{R}) M + \frac{\mathcal{R} + 2}{\mathcal{R}} T M = \mathcal{C}, \quad (3.4)$$

where we have introduced two linear operators on the set of symmetric superfields, by $(SM)_{\alpha\beta} = S_{\alpha\beta}^{\alpha'\beta'} M_{\alpha'\beta'}$, and $(TM)_{\alpha\beta} = T_{\alpha\beta}^{\alpha'\beta'} M_{\alpha'\beta'}$, with

$$S_{\alpha\beta}^{\alpha'\beta'} = \delta_\alpha^{\alpha'} \theta^{\beta'} \partial_\beta + \delta_\beta^{\beta'} \theta^{\alpha'} \partial_\alpha \quad (3.5)$$

$$T_{\alpha\beta}^{\alpha'\beta'} = \theta^\gamma \left(\theta^{\beta'} (\sigma^a)_{\beta\gamma} \delta_\alpha^{\alpha'} + \theta^{\alpha'} (\sigma^a)_{\alpha\gamma} \delta_\beta^{\beta'} \right) \partial_a \quad (3.6)$$

Moreover, the non linear term $\mathcal{C}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{C}_{\alpha\beta}^{[p]} = (p+2) \sum_{q=1}^{p-1} \frac{\left[\theta^\gamma M_{\alpha\gamma}^{[q-1]}, \theta^\delta M_{\beta\delta}^{[p-q-1]} \right]_+}{(q+1)(p-q+1)}. \quad (3.7)$$

Note, that the operator S commutes with $\mathcal{R}$ whereas T raises the level by 2. Thus, (3.4) indeed builds a recursive system, relating the higher levels of $M_{\alpha\beta}$ to the image of the lower ones under T .

Algebraic properties of S and T By explicit computation one verifies that the operator S satisfies the equation

$$(S - 2)(S + \mathcal{R}) = 0 \quad (3.8)$$

Thus, at a given level $\mathcal{R} = p$, the operator S has only two different eigenvalues. We may hence decompose $\mathcal{M}$ into the eigenspaces of S :

$$\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}^+ + \mathcal{M}^-, \quad (S + \mathcal{R}) \mathcal{M}^+ = 0, \quad (S - 2) \mathcal{M}^- = 0. \quad (3.9)$$

With (3.5) one finds that $(S-2)$ and $(S+\mathcal{R})$ are proportional to the projectors onto the following Young diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
p+1 \left\{ \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \\ \hline \square & \\ \hline \vdots & \\ \hline \square & \\ \hline \end{array} \right. & p \left\{ \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \\ \hline \vdots & & \\ \hline \square & & \\ \hline \end{array} \right. & (3.10) \\
\mathcal{M}^{+ [p]} & \mathcal{M}^{- [p]} &
\end{array}$$

Moreover, one may verify the algebraic relations

$$T^2 = 0 , \quad (3.11)$$

$$(S-2)T = 0 = T(S+\mathcal{R}) ; \quad (3.12)$$

i.e. the level raising operator T is nilpotent and acts nontrivially only between $\mathcal{M}^+$ and $\mathcal{M}^-$:

$$T : \mathcal{M}^{+ [p]} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^{- [p+2]} . \quad (3.13)$$

The non linear terms of the field equations (3.4) are lumped into $\mathcal{C}$. In the weak field approximation the right hand side of this equation is negligible. Since T is nilpotent, there is then an interesting analogy between equation (3.4) and the descent equations [20]. However, these involve in general two nilpotent operators, whereas in our case S satisfies equation (3.8) instead of being nilpotent.

General solution Let us separate the two eigenvalues of S in equation (3.4) according to (3.9). It is easy to verify that $\mathcal{C}^+ = 0$. Thus one gets

$$TM^- = 0, \quad \mathcal{R}M^- + TM^+ = \mathcal{C}.$$

The first relation is automatically satisfied because of (3.12). In conclusion, M^+ is arbitrary, and

$$M^- = \mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathcal{C} - TM^+) \quad (3.14)$$

Thus, M^+ contains the independent components in $M_{\alpha\beta}$ left over by the gauge fixing (3.1). Comparing the Young diagrams (3.10) to (3.2) we hence

recover the independent components identified in the vector potential A_α after imposing the recursion gauge. The total and the independent number of components of $M^{[p]}$ are respectively given by

$$\dim \mathcal{M}^{[p]} = 136 \binom{16}{p}, \quad \dim \mathcal{M}^{+[p]} = (p+1) \binom{17}{p+2}. \quad (3.15)$$

We give a computation of these numbers in appendix B. Altogether, $M_{\alpha\beta}$ contains 983041 independent components. Since the gauge fixing (3.1) is defined by covariant constraints on the superfield, these components are necessarily expressible in terms of representations of the supersymmetry algebra (2.4). Of course, supersymmetry is not realized level by level. Decomposing M^+ into $SO(9)$ multiplets, we find the following structure

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_p \dim \mathcal{M}^{+[p]} &= 983041 \\ &= 1 + (44 + 84 + 128) \times (9 + 16 + 36 + 126 + 128 + 231 + \\ &\quad + 432 + 576 + 594 + 768 + 924). \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

The $256 = (44 + 84 + 128)$ corresponds precisely to the smallest irreducible off-shell multiplet of the 10d supersymmetry algebra (2.4) [3]. Consistently, M^+ forms a multiple of this multiplet. The additional singlet in (3.16) corresponds to the fact that we have not fixed the ordinary gauge invariance.

Dual space For future use, let us recall that we can introduce the dual space $\mathcal{M}_{\text{dual}}$ of superfields by means of the bilinear form

$$\langle F | G \rangle = \int d\underline{\theta} \sum_{\alpha\beta} \tilde{F}^{\alpha\beta}(\underline{x}, \underline{\theta}) G_{\alpha\beta}(\underline{x}, \underline{\theta}) \quad (3.17)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} |G\rangle &\in \mathcal{M}, \quad \langle F| \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{dual}}, \\ \tilde{F}^{[p]\alpha\beta}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_p} &= \frac{1}{(16-p)!} \sum_{\alpha_{p+1}, \dots, \alpha_{16}} \epsilon_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_{16}} F^{[16-p]\alpha\beta, \alpha_{p+1} \dots \alpha_{16}} \end{aligned}$$

Breaking the $O(9, 1)$ invariance, one may identify $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\text{dual}}$ by means of $\sigma_{\alpha\beta}^0$, for example. With respect to the decomposition $SO(9, 1) \rightarrow SO(2, 1) \times SO(7)$, the bilinear form (3.17) then yields an $SO(7)$ invariant scalar product.

on $\mathcal{M}$, on which the $SO(2, 1)$ generators act as We are going to use this scalar product in the subsequent analysis of the superfield constraints (2.25). Note finally, that with respect to this scalar product the operator S from (3.5) is self-adjoint

$$S^{\text{ad}} = S . \quad (3.18)$$

3.2 Extracting dynamics from the superspace constraints

So far in this section, we have restricted the supercurl $M_{\alpha\beta}$ only by the recursion gauge condition (3.1), thereby restricting the gauge freedom (2.7). Further restrictions and in particular dynamical equations arise from imposing further constraints (2.18), (2.19), and (2.20), respectively, on the supercurl. These constraints have been casted into the form of projections under an operator K , $K^2 = K$, $\bar{K} \equiv I - K$, such that $M_{\alpha\beta}$ is subject to

$$\bar{K}_{\alpha\beta}^{\alpha'\beta'} M_{\alpha'\beta'} = 0 . \quad (3.19)$$

This defines a decomposition of the superfields in $\mathcal{M}$ into

$$\mathcal{M} = K\mathcal{M} + \bar{K}\mathcal{M} \equiv \mathcal{M}_{\parallel} + \mathcal{M}_{\perp} . \quad (3.20)$$

The role of K is twofold. First, it further restricts the field content in the superfield $M_{\alpha\beta}$ by certain algebraic relations; secondly, it implies field equations for the remaining independent superfield components.

The explicit projectors for the dynamical constraints (2.18), (2.19), and (2.20) are given by

$$(K_{\text{YM}})_{\alpha\beta}^{\alpha'\beta'} = \frac{1}{16} (\sigma^a)_{\alpha\beta} (\sigma_a)^{\alpha'\beta'} , \quad (3.21)$$

$$\begin{aligned} (K_{\text{I}})_{\mu\nu}^{\mu'\nu'} &= \frac{1}{8} \delta_{\mu\nu} \delta^{\mu'\nu'} , \\ (K_{\text{I}})_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{\bar{\mu}'\bar{\nu}'} &= \frac{1}{8} \delta_{\mu\bar{\nu}} \delta^{\bar{\mu}'\bar{\nu}'} , \\ (K_{\text{I}})_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{\mu'\bar{\nu}'} &= \frac{1}{8} \delta_{\mu\bar{\nu}} \delta^{\mu'\bar{\nu}'} + \frac{1}{8} \gamma^i_{\mu\bar{\nu}} \gamma_i^{\mu'\bar{\nu}'} + \frac{1}{16} \gamma^{ij}_{\mu\bar{\nu}} \gamma_{ij}^{\mu'\bar{\nu}'} , \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

$$\begin{aligned} (K_{\text{IR}})_{\mu\nu}^{\mu'\nu'} &= 0 , \\ (K_{\text{IR}})_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{\bar{\mu}'\bar{\nu}'} &= 0 \\ (K_{\text{IR}})_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{\mu'\bar{\nu}'} &= \frac{1}{8} \gamma^i_{\mu\bar{\nu}} \gamma_i^{\mu'\bar{\nu}'} + \frac{1}{16} \gamma^{ij}_{\mu\bar{\nu}} \gamma_{ij}^{\mu'\bar{\nu}'} . \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

as one extracts from (2.15), (2.26) and (2.29) (putting for simplicity $v^i = \delta^{i8}$, cf. appendix A). These projectors are self-adjoint w.r.t. to the scalar product (3.17), i.e. $K_{\text{YM}} = K_{\text{YM}}^{\text{ad}}$, etc.

Note, that K_{I} is the weakest of these constraints in the sense that

$$K_{\text{YM}}\mathcal{M} \subset K_{\text{I}}\mathcal{M} , \quad K_{\text{IR}}\mathcal{M} \subset K_{\text{I}}\mathcal{M} . \quad (3.24)$$

In the following, we are going to analyze the content of these sets of superspace constraints. To this end, we first give the general recipe how to obtain field content and field equations implied by a constraint of the type (3.19) and subsequently apply this formalism to the constraints (3.21), (3.22), and (3.23).

Field content To identify the physical field content among the components of the supercurl $M_{\alpha\beta}$, we collect the constraints that have been imposed on $M_{\alpha\beta}$. These are given by the recursion gauge expressed by (3.4) and the constraint (3.19):

$$\begin{aligned} (S + \mathcal{R}) M &= -\frac{\mathcal{R} + 2}{\mathcal{R}} T M + \mathcal{C} , \\ \overline{K} M &= 0 . \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

This obviously leaves

$$\mathcal{M}_{\parallel}^+ \equiv \mathcal{M}_{\parallel} \cap \mathcal{M}^+ = \ker \overline{K} \cap \ker (S + \mathcal{R}) , \quad (3.26)$$

undetermined. The independent (or physical) superfield components in $M_{\alpha\beta}$ are hence given by $\mathcal{M}_{\parallel}^+$, the space of eigenvectors of the operator KSK with eigenvalue $-p$. The remaining part of $M_{\alpha\beta}$ is consequently determined by the system (3.25) in terms of derivatives and nonlinear combinations of the physical fields. The fact that this part is in fact overdetermined by (3.25) then in turn implies the field equations as we shall discuss now.

Field equations The dynamical equations arise from combining the two equations of (3.25) into

$$(S + \mathcal{R}) M_{\parallel}^{[p]} + \frac{\mathcal{R} + 2}{\mathcal{R}} T M_{\parallel}^{[p-2]} = \mathcal{C}^{[p]} . \quad (3.27)$$

This defines $M_{\parallel}^{[p]}$ in terms of the lower levels unless we project out onto vectors $\langle z|$ such that

$$\langle z| (S + \mathcal{R}) M_{\parallel}^{[p]} = \langle z| (S + \mathcal{R}) K M^{[p]} = 0 ,$$

in which case (3.27) implies a restriction on the image of T . The relevant vectors $\langle z|$ are hence simultaneous eigenvectors of K^{ad} with zero eigenvalue and of S^{ad} with eigenvalue 2

$$\langle z| (S + \mathcal{R}) K = 0 ,$$

we denote them as $\langle z_{\perp}^-|$. These are eigenvectors of $\overline{K}^{\text{ad}} S^{\text{ad}} \overline{K}^{\text{ad}}$ with eigenvalue 2. (As discussed above, for the superspace constraint we find that S , K_{I} , and K_{IR} are self-adjoint w.r.t. the scalar product induced by (3.17).) For any such eigenvector $\langle z_{\perp}^-|$, (3.25) yields the dynamical equation

$$\frac{p+2}{p} \langle z_{\perp}^-| T M_{\parallel}^{[p-2]} = \langle z_{\perp}^-| \mathcal{C}^{[p]} \quad (3.28)$$

Vice versa, if (3.28) is satisfied for all vectors of the form $\langle z_{\perp}^-|$, the system (3.25) has a solution for $M_{\alpha\beta}^{[p]}$ in terms of the lower levels.

Thus, the basic information about the content of the dynamical constraint (3.19) concerns the set of simultaneous eigenvectors $\langle z_{\perp}^-|$ and $|z_{\parallel}^+\rangle$, respectively. We denote the corresponding spaces by $\mathcal{M}_{\perp}^-$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\parallel}^+$, respectively. Counting of dimensions yields the identity

$$\dim \mathcal{M}_{\perp} - \dim \mathcal{M}^+ = \dim \mathcal{M}_{\perp}^- - \dim \mathcal{M}_{\parallel}^+ , \quad (3.29)$$

where the numbers on the l.h.s. can simply be extracted from the representation tables of $SO(9, 1)$ and $SO(2, 1) \times SO(7)$, respectively. For the lowest levels, these tables are collected in appendix C.

4 The physical field content.

In this chapter, we will determine the field content which is induced by the different dynamical constraints K_{YM} , K_{I} , and K_{IR} . The result for the latter is summarized in the tables (4.13) and (4.17). We recall, that with the strong superspace constraint (2.15), the arbitrariness in the supercurl $M_{\alpha\beta}$ is

restricted to the levels $p = 0$ and $p = 1$, i.e. all higher levels are determined. By analyzing the Bianchi identities for the supercurvature one verifies that in this case the following superfield relation holds [1]

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{R}+1) M_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{2} (\sigma^a)_{\alpha\beta} (\sigma_a{}^{bc})_{\gamma_1\gamma_2} \theta^{\gamma_1} \theta^{\gamma_2} F_{bc} , \quad (4.1)$$

where

$$F_{ab} = \partial_a A_b - \partial_b A_a + [A_a, A_b]_- ,$$

is now the curvature of the superfield A_a . Together with (3.3), one hence obtains recurrence relations which completely determine $M_{\alpha\beta}$ in terms of its lowest components – the physical fields X_a and ϕ^α . The field content associated with K_{YM} hence precisely coincides with the ten-dimensional Yang-Mills multiplet.

With the integrable (2.19) and the reduced integrable constraint (2.20) the situation becomes essentially more complex. In particular, there will be more superfield components left undetermined by the recurrent relations, i.e. the spectrum of states turns out to be considerably larger. In this section we analyze the physical field content associated with these integrable superfield constraints K_{IR} and K_{I} .

According to the general discussion above, the independent components in the supercurl $M_{\alpha\beta}$ are given by the space $\mathcal{M}_{\parallel}^+$, i.e. by the intersection of the kernels of $(S+\mathcal{R})$ and $\overline{K}$. We start from (3.29)

$$\dim \mathcal{M}_{\parallel}^+ = \dim \mathcal{M}^+ - \dim \mathcal{M}_{\perp} + \dim \mathcal{M}_{\perp}^- , \quad (4.2)$$

and will in the following determine the r.h.s. of this equation for K_{IR} and K_{I} . To this end we first describe the decomposition of superfields into irreducible representations of $SO(2, 1)$.

4.1 Decomposition into $SO(2, 1)$ representations

The integrable constraints (3.22), (3.23) are still invariant under the action of $SO(2, 1)$ corresponding to the second factor in $SO(9, 1) \rightarrow SO(2, 1) \times SO(7)$. This provides a convenient way to organize the spectrum. Explicitly, this group acts on the supercurl as given in (A.3). The generators are pairwise adjoint with respect to the scalar product defined in (3.17)

$$\delta_0^{\text{ad}} = \delta_0 , \quad \delta_{\pm 1}^{\text{ad}} = \delta_{\mp 1} .$$

The supercurl $M_{\alpha\beta}$ may hence be decomposed according to the spin of $SO(2, 1)$. We label the total $SO(2, 1)$ spin by ℓ and its z -component (i.e. the eigenvalue of δ_0 which is raised resp. lowered by $\delta_{\pm}$) by ℓ_0 . According to the action of δ_0 , the value of ℓ_0 is given by the difference of barred and unbarred indices in a superfield $M_{\alpha\beta, \gamma_1 \dots \gamma_p}$. Specifically, $\mathcal{M}_{\ell_0}^{[p]}$ is spanned by vectors

$$M = \begin{cases} M_{\mu\nu, \mu_1 \dots \mu_{k-1}, \bar{\rho}_1 \dots \bar{\rho}_{l+1}} \\ M_{\mu\bar{\nu}, \mu_1 \dots \mu_k, \bar{\rho}_1 \dots \bar{\rho}_l} \\ M_{\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}, \mu_1 \dots \mu_{k+1}, \bar{\rho}_1 \dots \bar{\rho}_{l-1}} \end{cases}, \quad \text{with } p = k + l, \quad \ell_0 = \frac{1}{2}(l - k), \quad (4.3)$$

and the spin ℓ states are generated by highest weight states at $\ell_0 = \ell$ obtained from (4.3) by modding out the action of δ_+ , i.e. satisfying

$$\begin{cases} M_{\mu\nu, \mu_1 \dots \mu_{k-2}, [\bar{\rho}_1, \bar{\rho}_2 \dots \bar{\rho}_{l+2}]} = 0 \\ k M_{\mu\bar{\nu}, \mu_1 \dots \mu_{k-1}, [\bar{\rho}_1, \bar{\rho}_2 \dots \bar{\rho}_{l+1}]} = M_{\mu\nu, \mu_1 \dots \mu_{k-1}, \bar{\rho}_1 \dots \bar{\rho}_{l+1}} \\ (k+1) M_{\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}, \mu_1 \dots \mu_k, [\bar{\rho}_1, \bar{\rho}_2 \dots \bar{\rho}_l]} = M_{\mu\bar{\nu}, \mu_1 \dots \mu_k, \bar{\rho}_1 \dots \bar{\rho}_l} + M_{\bar{\mu}\nu, \mu_1 \dots \mu_k, \bar{\rho}_1 \dots \bar{\rho}_l} \end{cases} \quad (4.4)$$

Furthermore, the space $\mathcal{M}^{[p]}$ may be decomposed according to the action of the symmetric group on the $p+2$ spinor indices. This is most conveniently described in terms of Young diagrams, where we use the standard notation $[a_1, \dots, a_n]$ to describe the Young diagram with n rows of length $a_1, \dots, a_n$. By $[a_1, \dots, a_n]'$ we denote the conjugated Young diagram consisting of n columns of length $a_1, \dots, a_n$. Each box of the Young diagrams now represents a **8** of $SO(7)$. The relations (4.3), (4.4) then imply

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{\ell \neq 0}^{[p]} &= [2] \times ([l-1, k+1]' + [l, k]' + [l+1, k-1]') + [1, 1] \times [l, k]', \\ \mathcal{M}_{\ell=0}^{[p]} &= [2] \times [k+1, k-1]' + [1, 1] \times [k, k]'. \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

Since the decomposition (3.9) of $\mathcal{M}^{[p]}$ has been defined purely in terms of permuting the spinor indices, it commutes with the action of the symmetric group. The Young diagram decomposition of the eigenspaces $\mathcal{M}^+$ and $\mathcal{M}^-$ may be obtained from (3.10) by analyzing the decomposition of the Young diagrams under $\mathbf{16} \mapsto \mathbf{8} + \mathbf{8}$. Specifically, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{\ell \neq 0}^+ &= [l+1, k+1]' + [l, k+2]' + [l, k+1, 1]' + [l+2, k]' + [l+1, k, 1]', \\ \mathcal{M}_{\ell=0}^+ &= [k+2, k]' + [k+1, k, 1]'. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

In particular, this gives the dimension

$$\dim \mathcal{M}_{\ell=0}^{+[p]} = \binom{8}{k+1} \binom{9}{k} \frac{17k+7}{(k+1)(k+2)} .$$

4.2 The reduced integrable constraint

Here, we analyze the field content associated with the reduced integrable constraint K_{IR} , given by (3.23). This constraint may be equivalently rewritten as

$$K_{\text{IR}} M_{\mu\nu} = 0 = K_{\text{IR}} M_{\overline{\mu}\overline{\nu}} , \quad K_{\text{IR}} M_{\mu\overline{\nu}} = \frac{1}{2} (M_{\mu\overline{\nu}} - M_{\nu\overline{\mu}}) , \quad (4.7)$$

and hence commutes with the action of the symmetric group on the **8** spinor indices (in contrast to K_{YM} and K_{I}). This fact allows to completely resolve this case without any explicit reference to the decomposition of the superfield into irreducible representations of $SO(7)$ or $SO(9,1)$, respectively.

According to (4.2) we have to determine the spaces $\mathcal{M}_{\perp}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\perp}^{-}$. We start with $\mathcal{M}_{\perp} = \overline{K}_{\text{IR}} \mathcal{M}$. According to (4.7) and (4.4), the spin ℓ sector of $\mathcal{M}_{\perp}$ is given by the vectors satisfying

$$\begin{cases} M_{\mu\nu, \mu_1 \dots \mu_{k-2} [\overline{\rho}_1, \overline{\rho}_2 \dots \overline{\rho}_{l+2}]} = 0 \\ k M_{\mu\overline{\nu}, \mu_1 \dots \mu_{k-1} [\overline{\rho}_1, \overline{\rho}_2 \dots \overline{\rho}_{l+1}]} = M_{\mu\nu, \mu_1 \dots \mu_{k-1}, \overline{\rho}_1 \dots \overline{\rho}_{l+1}} \\ (k+1) M_{\overline{\mu}\overline{\nu}, \mu_1 \dots \mu_k [\overline{\rho}_1, \overline{\rho}_2 \dots \overline{\rho}_l]} = 2 M_{\mu\overline{\nu}, \mu_1 \dots \mu_k, \overline{\rho}_1 \dots \overline{\rho}_l} \end{cases} \quad (4.8)$$

In other words, each vector is given by its part $M_{\overline{\mu}\overline{\nu}}$, satisfying the constraint

$$M_{\overline{\mu}\overline{\nu}, \mu_1 \dots \mu_{k-2} [\overline{\rho}_1 \overline{\rho}_2 \overline{\rho}_3, \overline{\rho}_4 \dots \overline{\rho}_{l+2}]} = 0 ,$$

the other parts of M are determined from this by (4.8). This gives the Young diagram decomposition of $\overline{K}_{\text{IR}} \mathcal{M}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{K}_{\text{IR}} \mathcal{M}_{\ell \neq 0} &= 2 \cdot [l+1, k, 1]' + 2 \cdot [l, k+1, 1]' + [l+2, k]' + [l, k+2]' \\ &\quad + [l-1, k+1, 1, 1]' + [l+1, k-1, 1, 1]' + [l+2, k-1, 1]' \\ &\quad + [l-1, k+2, 1]' + [l+1, k+1]' + [l, k, 1, 1]' , \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

$$\overline{K}_{\text{IR}} \mathcal{M}_{\ell=0} = [k+1, k, 1]' + [k+2, k]' + [k+1, k-1, 1, 1]' + [k+2, k-1, 2]' .$$

It remains to determine $\mathcal{M}_\perp^-$, the space of common eigenvectors of S and $\bar{K}_{\text{IR}}$. For this, we consider the operator $S_{\text{IR}} \equiv \bar{K}_{\text{IR}} S \bar{K}_{\text{IR}}$ whose action on $M_{\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}}$ is found from (3.5) and (4.8) to be:

$$\begin{aligned} (S_{\text{IR}} M^{[p]})_{\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}, \mu_1 \dots \mu_{k+1}, \bar{\rho}_1 \dots \bar{\rho}_{l-1}} &= 2(l-1) M_{\bar{\mu}\bar{\rho}_1, \mu_1 \dots \mu_{k+1}, \bar{\nu}\bar{\rho}_2 \dots \bar{\rho}_{l-1}}^{[p]} \\ &\quad - (k+1) M_{\bar{\mu}\mu_1, \bar{\nu}\mu_2 \dots \mu_{k+1}, \bar{\rho}_1 \dots \bar{\rho}_{l-1}}^{[p]} \\ &\quad + (k+1)(l-1) M_{\bar{\mu}\mu_1, \bar{\rho}_1 \mu_2 \dots \mu_{k+1}, \bar{\nu}\bar{\rho}_2 \dots \bar{\rho}_{l-1}}^{[p]} . \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

The operator S_{IR} obviously does not commute with its ancestor S and correspondingly has eigenvalues which do not necessarily coincide with those of S . However, since $\bar{K}_{\text{IR}}$ is an orthogonal projector, it follows that the eigenvalues of S_{IR} lie in the interval $[-p, 2]$. Moreover, eigenvectors of S_{IR} with eigenvalues $-p$ and 2 , respectively, are necessarily also eigenvectors of S . Diagonalizing the action (4.10), S_{IR} finally may be decomposed into projectors $\mathcal{P}_{[\dots]}$ onto the Young diagrams from (4.9), respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{IR}} &= 2 \left(\mathcal{P}_{[l-1, k+1, 1, 1]} + \mathcal{P}_{[l+1, k-1, 1, 1]} + \mathcal{P}_{[l, k, 1, 1]} + \mathcal{P}_{[l+2, k-1, 1]} \right) \\ &\quad + 2 \left(\mathcal{P}_{[l-1, k+2, 1]} + \mathcal{P}_{[l+1, k, 1]} + \mathcal{P}_{[l, k+1, 1]} \right) + (2-k) \mathcal{P}_{[l+2, k]} \\ &\quad + (1-l) \mathcal{P}_{[l, k+2]} - \frac{k+2l}{2} \mathcal{P}_{[l, k+1, 1]} + \frac{2-k-l}{2} \mathcal{P}_{[l+1, k+1]} - \frac{2k+l-1}{2} \mathcal{P}_{[l+1, k, 1]} , \\ &\quad \text{for } l > k , \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{IR}} &= 2 \left(\mathcal{P}_{[k+1, k-1, 1, 1]} + \mathcal{P}_{[k+2, k-1, 1]} \right) + (2-k) \mathcal{P}_{[k+2, k]} + \frac{1-3k}{2} \mathcal{P}_{[k+1, k, 1]} , \\ &\quad \text{for } l = k . \end{aligned}$$

The eigenspaces with eigenvalue 2 in this decomposition span the space $\mathcal{M}_\perp^-$. Putting (4.6), (4.9), and (4.11) together, we find from (4.2)

$$\dim \mathcal{M}_\parallel^+ = \begin{cases} \dim([l+2]') = \binom{8}{l+2} & \text{for } k = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} . \quad (4.12)$$

The exceptional role of $k = 0$ stems from the fact that for this value the eigenvalue of the corresponding Young diagram $[l+2, k]'$ in (4.11) takes the extremal values 2 such that at $k=0$ this eigenspace becomes part of $\mathcal{M}_\perp^-$.

With (4.2) we hence have obtained the entire physical field content in the superfield $M_{\alpha\beta}$ induced by the reduced integrable superspace constraint K_{IR} . We collect the result in the following table, organized by level p and $SO(2, 1)$ spin ℓ :

ℓ	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	$\frac{3}{2}$	2	$\frac{5}{2}$	3
$p=0$	7+21						
$p=1$		8+48					
$p=2$			1+7+27+35				
$p=3$				8+48			
$p=4$					7+21		
$p=5$						8	
$p=6$							1

(4.13)

The total number of states is $769 = 384 + 384 + 1$, where $384 + 384$ corresponds to 3 copies of the irreducible off-shell multiplet $(128 + 128)$ of [3] and the singlet captures the remaining bosonic gauge freedom. This counting is the first hint, that the field content of the reduced integrable constraint remains completely off-shell, a fact that we shall show in the next chapters.

4.3 The integrable constraint

Here, we analyze the field content associated with the integrable constraint K_{I} , given by (3.22). Comparing to the result (4.13) for the stronger constraint K_{IR} , even more fields must appear in this case. Note that in this section $\mathcal{M}_{\parallel}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\perp}$ refer to the decomposition (3.20) with respect to K_{I} . Nevertheless, it is $\overline{K}_{\text{I}}\mathcal{M} = \overline{K}_{\text{IR}}\mathcal{M}$. To make use of the result of the previous section, we rewrite (4.2) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\dim \mathcal{M}_{\parallel}^+ &= \dim \mathcal{M}^+ - \dim \mathcal{M}_{\perp} + \dim \mathcal{M}_{\perp}^- \\
&= \left(\dim \mathcal{M}^+ - \dim (\overline{K}_{\text{IR}}\mathcal{M})^+ \right) + \dim (\overline{K}_{\text{IR}}\mathcal{M})_{\parallel}^+ .
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.14}$$

where the term in the brackets on the r.h.s. has been determined in (4.12) above and $(\overline{K}_{\text{IR}}\mathcal{M})_{\parallel}^+$ is defined to be the intersection of

$$\begin{aligned}
(\overline{K}_{\text{IR}}\mathcal{M})^+ &\equiv (S_{\text{IR}} - 2) \overline{K}_{\text{IR}}\mathcal{M} , \\
\text{and } (\overline{K}_{\text{IR}}\mathcal{M})_{\parallel} &\equiv \overline{K}_{\text{IR}}K_{\text{I}}\mathcal{M} .
\end{aligned}$$

This space hence contains the fields that enlarge the spectrum with respect to (4.13). Its dimension remains to be computed.

We first consider the case $l = k$, i.e. the $SO(2, 1)$ singlets. The space $(\overline{K}_{\text{IR}}\mathcal{M})_{\parallel}^+$ then is generated by vectors $v = v_1 + v_2$ such that v_1 and v_2 are eigenvectors of S_{IR} with eigenvalues $(2-k)$ and $\frac{1}{2}(1-3k)$, respectively – cf. (4.11) –, which in particular satisfy

$$K_{\text{I}}S_{\text{IR}}v = K_{\text{I}}S_{\text{IR}}K_{\text{I}}v = \frac{1}{4}(k-2)v. \quad (4.15)$$

The second equality is obtained from contracting (4.10) over $\overline{\mu\nu}$. Since K_{I} is an orthogonal projector, comparing (4.15) to the eigenvalues of S_{IR} shows, that it can be satisfied only if

$$\frac{1}{2}(1-3k) \leq \frac{1}{4}(k-2) \leq (2-k) \quad \implies \quad p = 2k \leq 4. \quad (4.16)$$

For $p=4$ one may show by a similar but slightly more complicated analysis of the operator $(K_{\text{I}}S_{\text{IR}}K_{\text{I}}S_{\text{IR}}K_{\text{I}})$, that $(\overline{K}_{\text{IR}}\mathcal{M})_{\parallel}^+$ is empty also at this level. We leave details to the reader. At $p=2$, in contrast, it is $\overline{K}_{\text{IR}}\mathcal{M} = (\overline{K}_{\text{IR}}\mathcal{M})^+$ and hence $\dim(\overline{K}_{\text{IR}}\mathcal{M})_{\parallel}^+ = \dim(\overline{K}_{\text{IR}}K_{\text{I}}\mathcal{M}) = 7+21$.

For states of arbitrary $SO(2, 1)$ spin $\ell = \frac{1}{2}(l-k)$ one shows by similar reasoning, that $\dim(\overline{K}_{\text{IR}}\mathcal{M})_{\parallel}^+ = \binom{8}{k+1}$ iff $l = 1$. The complete result is summarized in the following table:

ℓ	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	$\frac{3}{2}$	2	$\frac{5}{2}$	3
$p=0$	7+21		1				
$p=1$		8+8+48					
$p=2$	7+21		1+7+27+35				
$p=3$				8+48			
$p=4$					7+21		
$p=5$						8	
$p=6$							1

(4.17)

The total number of fields in this case is $816 = 416 + 400$.

5 Recurrent relations.

Having determined the field content, we will derive the recurrent relations which explicitly determine the higher level superfield components in terms

of the lower level components. For simplicity, we restrict for the rest of the paper to purely bosonic configurations, e.g. we set all fermionic fields to zero. This is just for the sake of clarity, the techniques may likewise be applied to determine the structure of the fermionic fields and field equations. In particular, supersymmetry is unbroken up to this point.

For the strong superfield constraint, the superfield $M_{\alpha\beta}$ is entirely determined by its zero level components which are the physical Yang-Mills fields. The recurrent relations which determine the higher superfield levels have been given in (4.1). With the integrable constraints (2.19), (2.20) the picture becomes more complicated. In view of the field content (4.13) and (4.17), a huge amount of additional fields has to be introduced to eventually obtain closed recurrence relations which replace (4.1).

To keep things tractable, we will most of the time restrict the analysis to those fields which transform as singlets under the $SO(2,1)$ symmetry underlying (2.23). Despite this technical restriction, the method described in the following allows straight-forward although more tedious generalization to the higher spin fields.

5.1 The reduced integrable constraint

In the spin zero sector the field content associated with K_{IR} according to (4.13) contains an antisymmetric tensor field in addition to the seven dimensional Yang-Mills vector field. We have shown that in principle all higher levels $p > 0$ of $M_{\alpha\beta}$ are uniquely determined in terms of these fields.

To make this dependence explicit, we start from the system (3.25)

$$(S + p) M^{[p]} = -\frac{p+2}{p} T M^{[p-2]} + \mathcal{C}^{[p]}. \quad (5.1)$$

Contracting this equation with K_{IR} , we obtain

$$(K_{\text{IR}} S K_{\text{IR}} + p K_{\text{IR}}) M^{[p]} = -\frac{p+2}{p} K_{\text{IR}} T M^{[p-2]} + K_{\text{IR}} \mathcal{C}^{[p]}. \quad (5.2)$$

Recall, that the space $\mathcal{M}_{\ell=0}$ decomposes into

$$\overline{K}_{\text{IR}} \mathcal{M} = [k+1, k, 1]' + [k+2, k]' + [k+1, k-1, 1, 1]' + [k+2, k-1, 2]'$$

$$K_{\text{IR}} \mathcal{M} = [k+1, k, 1]' + [k+2, k]' + [k, k, 2]'$$

Together with the eigenvalue decomposition (4.6) of S this gives the eigenvalues of the operator $(K_{\text{IR}} S K_{\text{IR}})$ at each level p , which are 2 , $-\frac{p}{2}$, and $\frac{1}{4}(6-p)$.

This allows to effectively invert the system (5.2) to obtain

$$M^{[p]} = \Xi^{[p]} T M^{[p-2]} - \frac{p}{p+2} \Xi^{[p]} \mathcal{C}^{[p]} , \quad (5.3)$$

$$\text{with } \Xi^{[p]} = \left\{ -\frac{8}{3p^2(p+2)} (K_{\text{IR}} S K_{\text{IR}})^2 + \frac{2(p+14)}{3p^2(p+2)} (K_{\text{IR}} S K_{\text{IR}}) - \frac{3p^2+10p+24}{3p^2(p+2)} K_{\text{IR}} \right\} .$$

Thus, we have completely resolved this sector with an explicit recurrent definition of all higher level components of the superfield $M_{\alpha\beta}$. In a similar way, one may obtain the defining relations for the higher $SO(2,1)$ spin sectors.

As an illustration, we evaluate the lowest two bosonic levels of the supercurl $M_{\alpha\beta}$. They are determined by the level zero fields: the seven dimensional Yang-Mills vector field X_i and an antisymmetric tensor field B_{ij} :

$$M_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{[0]} = \gamma^i_{\mu\bar{\nu}} X_i + \gamma^{ij}_{\mu\bar{\nu}} B_{ij} , \quad (5.4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{[2]} = & \left(\frac{1}{2} \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{ij} \delta_{\rho_1 \bar{\rho}_2} - \frac{1}{2} \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^m \gamma_{\rho_1 \bar{\rho}_2}^{ijm} + \frac{1}{4} \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{mn} \gamma_{\rho_1 \bar{\rho}_2}^{ijmn} \right) \theta^{\rho_1} \theta^{\bar{\rho}_2} Y_{ij} \\ & + \left(2 \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^i \delta_{\rho_1 \bar{\rho}_2} + \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{mn} \gamma_{\rho_1 \bar{\rho}_2}^{imn} \right) \theta^{\rho_1} \theta^{\bar{\rho}_2} \mathcal{D}^j B_{ij} \\ & + \left(\gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^m \gamma_{\rho_1 \bar{\rho}_2}^{ijkm} - \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{km} \gamma_{\rho_1 \bar{\rho}_2}^{ijm} + 2 \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{km} \gamma_{\rho_1 \bar{\rho}_2}^{ijm} \right) \theta^{\rho_1} \theta^{\bar{\rho}_2} \mathcal{D}_k B_{ij} \\ & + \left(2 \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^m \gamma_{\rho_1 \bar{\rho}_2}^{ijm} + 2 \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{ij} \delta_{\rho_1 \bar{\rho}_2} + \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{mn} \gamma_{\rho_1 \bar{\rho}_2}^{ijmn} \right) \theta^{\rho_1} \theta^{\bar{\rho}_2} [B_{ik}, B_j^k] \\ & + 2 \left(\gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^l \gamma_{\rho_1 \bar{\rho}_2}^{ijk} + \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{lm} \gamma_{\rho_1 \bar{\rho}_2}^{ijkm} \right) \theta^{\rho_1} \theta^{\bar{\rho}_2} [B_{ij}, B_{kl}] . \end{aligned}$$

Here, Y_{ij} is the Yang-Mills field strength

$$Y_{ij} = \partial_i X_j - \partial_j X_i + [X_i, X_j]_- , \quad (5.5)$$

and $\mathcal{D}_k$ denotes the gauge covariant derivative

$$\mathcal{D}_k B_{ij} = \partial_k B_{ij} + [X_k, B_{ij}] . \quad (5.6)$$

5.2 The integrable constraint

For the reduced integrable K_{IR} constraint, we have given the complete recurrent solution (5.3). Since the integrable constraint K_{I} is weaker in the sense

of (3.24), its field content is larger and the recurrent relations will involve more fields. From (4.17) we know already that the spectrum associated with K_I in its spin 0 sector contains another copy of the vector and tensor fields.

The system (5.1) in this case gives rise to the recurrent relations

$$M^{[p]} = \Xi^{[p]} \left(TM^{[p-2]} - \frac{p}{p+2} \mathcal{C}^{[p]} \right) + \left\{ \frac{p}{p+2} \Xi^{[p]} S + I \right\} K_I \bar{K}_{IR} N^{[p]}, \quad (5.7)$$

where $\Xi^{[p]}$ has been defined in (5.3) above, and N is a superfield which satisfies:

$$N = K_I \bar{K}_{IR} N \implies N = \begin{cases} N_{\mu\nu} = \delta_{\mu\nu} \theta^{\bar{\rho}} \partial_{\bar{\rho}} n \\ N_{\mu\bar{\nu}} = \delta_{\mu\bar{\nu}} n \\ N_{\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}} = \delta_{\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}} \theta^{\rho} \partial_{\rho} n \end{cases} \quad (5.8)$$

with a scalar superfield n , further constrained by (4.4). Taking different projections of (5.1) one may obtain the remaining recurrent relations which determine the higher levels of these scalar superfields in terms of the lower levels in $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha\beta}$ and n . These however becomes more tedious due to the fact that the integrable constraint can no longer be expressed entirely in terms of permuting spinor indices.

Here, we restrict to giving the first two levels of n which have the particularly simple form

$$n^{[0]} = 0 \quad (5.9)$$

$$n^{[2]} = \gamma^i_{\rho_1 \bar{\rho}_2} \theta^{\rho_1} \theta^{\bar{\rho}_2} Z_i + \gamma^{ij}_{\rho_1 \bar{\rho}_2} \theta^{\rho_1} \theta^{\bar{\rho}_2} C_{ij}.$$

The level $p = 2$ is completely undetermined and hence contains the additional physical fields denoted by Z_i and C_{ij} whose existence has been anticipated in (4.17). Evaluating (5.7) we find for the supercurl⁶

$$M_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{[0]} = \gamma^i_{\mu\bar{\nu}} X_i + \gamma^{ij}_{\mu\bar{\nu}} B_{ij}, \quad (5.10)$$

$$M_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{[2]} = \delta_{\mu\bar{\nu}} \gamma^i_{\rho_1 \bar{\rho}_2} \theta^{\bar{\rho}_1} \theta^{\bar{\rho}_2} Z_i + \delta_{\mu\bar{\nu}} \gamma^{ij}_{\rho_1 \bar{\rho}_2} \theta^{\bar{\rho}_1} \theta^{\bar{\rho}_2} C_{ij},$$

⁶With respect to a previous version of this article, the component fields have been redefined in order to make the structure more transparent. In particular, this brings the field equations into a much simpler form.

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{[2]} = & \left(\delta_{\mu\bar{\nu}} \gamma_{\rho_1\bar{\rho}_2}^i + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^i \delta_{\rho_1\bar{\rho}_2} + \frac{1}{4} \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{mn} \gamma_{\rho_1\bar{\rho}_2}^{imn} \right) \theta^{\rho_1} \theta^{\bar{\rho}_2} Z_i \\
& + \left(\delta_{\mu\bar{\nu}} \gamma_{\rho_1\bar{\rho}_2}^{ij} + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{ij} \delta_{\rho_1\bar{\rho}_2} + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^m \gamma_{\rho_1\bar{\rho}_2}^{ijm} + \frac{1}{4} \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{mn} \gamma_{\rho_1\bar{\rho}_2}^{ijmn} \right) \theta^{\rho_1} \theta^{\bar{\rho}_2} C_{ij} \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{2} \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{ij} \delta_{\rho_1\bar{\rho}_2} - \frac{1}{2} \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^m \gamma_{\rho_1\bar{\rho}_2}^{ijm} + \frac{1}{4} \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{mn} \gamma_{\rho_1\bar{\rho}_2}^{ijmn} \right) \theta^{\rho_1} \theta^{\bar{\rho}_2} Y_{ij} \\
& + \left(2 \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^i \delta_{\rho_1\bar{\rho}_2} + \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{mn} \gamma_{\rho_1\bar{\rho}_2}^{imn} \right) \theta^{\rho_1} \theta^{\bar{\rho}_2} \mathcal{D}^j B_{ij} \\
& + \left(\gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^m \gamma_{\rho_1\bar{\rho}_2}^{ijkm} - \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{km} \gamma_{\rho_1\bar{\rho}_2}^{ijm} + 2 \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{km} \gamma_{\rho_1\bar{\rho}_2}^{ijm} \right) \theta^{\rho_1} \theta^{\bar{\rho}_2} \mathcal{D}_k B_{ij} \\
& + \left(2 \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^m \gamma_{\rho_1\bar{\rho}_2}^{ijm} + 2 \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{ij} \delta_{\rho_1\bar{\rho}_2} + \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{mn} \gamma_{\rho_1\bar{\rho}_2}^{ijmn} \right) \theta^{\rho_1} \theta^{\bar{\rho}_2} [B_{ik}, B_j^k] \\
& + 2 \left(\gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^l \gamma_{\rho_1\bar{\rho}_2}^{ijk} + \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{lm} \gamma_{\rho_1\bar{\rho}_2}^{ijkm} \right) \theta^{\rho_1} \theta^{\bar{\rho}_2} [B_{ij}, B_{kl}] ,
\end{aligned}$$

$$M_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{[2]} = \delta_{\mu\bar{\nu}} \gamma_{\rho_1\bar{\rho}_2}^i \theta^{\rho_1} \theta^{\bar{\rho}_2} Z_i + \delta_{\mu\bar{\nu}} \gamma_{\rho_1\bar{\rho}_2}^{ij} \theta^{\rho_1} \theta^{\bar{\rho}_2} C_{ij} .$$

Summarizing, we have shown that in the sector of $SO(2,1)$ singlets, the supercurl $M_{\alpha\beta}$ in recursion gauge and with the integrable superspace constraint (3.22) imposed, is determined in all orders by the set of physical fields

$$X_i, B_{ij}, Z_i, C_{ij} , \quad (5.11)$$

which enter as components at the levels $p=0$ and $p=2$ of the superfield expansion of $M_{\alpha\beta}$ as given in (5.10). In the following, we will study what kind of dynamical relations we may in addition extract for these fields.

Since K_I is the weakest of the three constraints we are studying, the other two cases may be embedded as particular truncations of (5.10). It is easy to see that they correspond to

$$\begin{aligned}
K_{\text{YM}} : C_{ij} &= Y_{ij}, Z_i = 0, B_{ij} = 0, \\
K_{\text{IR}} : C_{ij} &= 0, Z_i = 0.
\end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

6 Field equations.

In this section we will determine the field equations implied by the integrable constraints K_I, K_{IR} for the physical fields. As in the previous chapter we

restrict to the dimensionally reduced situation where all fields depend only on the coordinates x^i , $i = 1, \dots, 7$, thereby consistently truncating the system to singlets under $SO(2, 1)$.

The field content in this sector is given by (5.11) for K_I , K_{IR} implies the further truncation (5.12). Following the general discussion of section 3, the dynamical content arises from projecting the image of the operator T according to (3.28) onto the space $\mathcal{M}_\perp^-$. Applying this to the integrable constraints, we find that K_{IR} in fact does not imply any field equation on the fields X_i , B_{ij} , such that the corresponding spectrum remains completely off-shell. The weaker constraint K_I which has a larger spectrum, will give rise to first order dynamical equations for the additional fields Z_i and C_{ij} , coupled to the off-shell fields X_i and B_{ij} .

Let us first recapitulate the case of the strong constraint. At level $p=2$ the supercurl is uniquely determined by the Yang-Mills fields according to the lowest order component of equation (4.1)

$$M_{\alpha\beta}^{[2]} = (\sigma^a)_{\alpha\beta} (\sigma_a)^{bc}{}_{\gamma_1\gamma_2} \theta^{\gamma_1} \theta^{\gamma_2} Y_{bc} . \quad (6.1)$$

Since there are no new fields arising on this level, relation (3.29) yields

$$\mathcal{M}_\parallel^+ = \emptyset \quad \implies \quad \dim \mathcal{M}_\perp^- = \dim \mathcal{M}_\perp - \dim \mathcal{M}^+ , \quad (6.2)$$

where the numbers on the r.h.s. may be extracted from the representation tables collected in appendix C. In particular, this shows that no field equations arise on this level.

At level $p=4$, equation (6.2) with table (C.4) shows that $\mathcal{M}_\perp^-$ is nonempty but contains e.g. the vector representation **10** of $SO(9, 1)$. According to (3.28) the dynamical equation is given by the scalar product

$$\left\langle \mathcal{M}_{\perp \mathbf{10}}^{[4]} \left| \left(TM_\parallel^{[2]} - \frac{2}{3} \mathcal{C}^{[4]} \right) \right. , \quad \text{with} \quad TM_\parallel^{[2]} \sim \partial^b Y_{ab} \quad (6.3)$$

Since this is the nondegenerate scalar product on a space of multiplicity one, it suffices to show that $TM_\parallel^{[2]} \neq 0$ (with $M_\parallel^{[2]}$ given by (6.1)) to indeed obtain the bosonic part of the Yang-Mills field equations

$$\mathcal{D}^b Y_{ab} = 0 . \quad (6.4)$$

One might expect to find further relations in the $SO(9, 1)$ representations **120** and **126**, respectively, in which according to (C.4) the space $\mathcal{M}_\perp^-$ also

has nonvanishing contributions. However, the first one contains precisely the Bianchi identities of Y_{ab} which are automatically satisfied, whereas there is no nontrivial image of T into the **126** as one may easily verify. Thus, in agreement with [1], there arise no further restrictions than the Yang-Mills equations of motion (6.4), here.

In the following, we repeat this analysis for the integrable constraints K_I and K_{IR} .

6.1 The reduced integrable constraint

For the reduced integrable constraint K_{IR} , the entire constraint is encoded in the system (5.1) of which we have already solved the projection (5.2) by imposing the recurrent relations (5.3). It remains to study the complementary projection:

$$\overline{K}_{IR} (S + p) M^{[p]} = -\frac{p+2}{p} \overline{K}_{IR} T M^{[p-2]} + \overline{K}_{IR} \mathcal{C}^{[p]}. \quad (6.5)$$

Plugging in the explicit solution (5.3), one obtains after some calculation

$$\overline{K}_{IR} (2S + (p-4)) \overline{K}_{IR} (4S + (3p-2)) \overline{K}_{IR} \left(T M^{[p-2]} - \frac{p}{p+2} \mathcal{C}^{[p]} \right) = 0. \quad (6.6)$$

This encodes the entire dynamics of this constraint. Comparing (6.6) with (4.11), one recognizes (3.28); the operator on the l.h.s. of this equation is precisely the projector onto $\mathcal{M}_\perp^-$.

However, it turns out (as we have explicitly checked for $p \leq 6$ and are confident that it holds on all levels) that equation (6.6) becomes an identity when $M^{[p-2]}$ is expressed by the recurrent relation (5.3). Hence, we conclude that for the reduced integrable constraint, the system (5.1) is solved by (5.3) without imposing any further relations on the physical fields. The system remains completely off-shell.

6.2 The integrable constraint

Let us turn to the integrable constraint K_I . Recall, that this is a weaker constraint than K_{IR} and hence gives rise to a larger spectrum. Likewise, the dynamical equations implied by this constraint must be compatible with the truncation (5.12) since the system associated with K_{IR} was completely off-shell. In other words, setting $Z_i = 0 = C_{ij}$ must solve all dynamical equations without imposing further dynamics on X_i, B_{ij} .

As we have shown above, at the level $p = 2$ of the supercurl $M_{\alpha\beta}$ we find new fields arising, the explicit formulae have been given in (5.10). From table (C.3) we find that $M_{\perp}^{-}$ is empty at this level, i.e. there are no field equations arising at $p = 2$, the projection (3.28) turns out to be satisfied without imposing any restrictions on the level zero fields.

At level $p = 4$, we expect some dynamical equations to appear in analogy with (6.3) for the strong constraint. We discuss the different irreducible representations of $SO(7)$, starting with the singlet **1**. According to (C.5), this appears in a particularly simple way, namely with multiplicity one. Moreover, the table shows that

$$\text{mult } \mathcal{M}_{\perp \mathbf{1}}^{-[4]} = 1 ,$$

i.e. according to (3.28), a dynamical equation arises from the scalar product

$$\left\langle \mathcal{M}_{\perp \mathbf{1}}^{-[4]} \left| \left(TM^{[2]} - \frac{2}{3} \mathcal{C}^{[4]} \right) \right. \right\rangle , \quad \text{with } M^{[2]} \text{ given by (5.10)} .$$

Similarly to (6.3), this scalar product is particularly simple to compute because it lives on a space $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{1}}^{[4]}$ of multiplicity one. With the explicit expression from (5.10) we arrive at the first field equation for the enlarged system

$$\mathcal{D}^i Z_i = \frac{4}{3} [C_{ij}, B^{ij}] . \quad (6.7)$$

Note, that this equation has no analogue in the original Yang-Mills system since in that system there is no combination of fields and derivatives transforming as singlet of $SO(9, 1)$ at this order.

Let us continue with the vector part **7** which should contain the analogue of the Yang-Mills equations of motion. For illustration, we will describe this sector in some detail. According to the general proceeding outlined above, we first determine the subspace $\mathcal{M}_{\perp}^{-}$ which by projection gives rise to the dynamical equations of the system. It follows from (C.5) and (6.2) that $\mathcal{M}_{\perp \mathbf{7}}^{-[4]}$ is nonempty with multiplicity one. To determine this space explicitly, it suffices to diagonalize the operator S from (3.5) on the space $\mathcal{M}_{\perp \mathbf{7}}^{[4]}$. A basis of the latter is e.g. given by

$$\begin{aligned} (w_1)_{\mu\bar{\nu}, \mu_1\mu_2\bar{\rho}_1\bar{\rho}_2}^i &= \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{mnk} \left(\gamma_{\mu_1\mu_2}^{mn} \gamma_{\bar{\rho}_1\bar{\rho}_2}^{ki} - \gamma_{\mu_1\mu_2}^{ki} \gamma_{\bar{\rho}_1\bar{\rho}_2}^{mn} \right) , \\ (w_2)_{\mu\bar{\nu}, \mu_1\mu_2\bar{\rho}_1\bar{\rho}_2}^i &= \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{imnk} \left(\gamma_{\mu_1\mu_2}^{mn} \gamma_{\bar{\rho}_1\bar{\rho}_2}^k - \gamma_{\mu_1\mu_2}^k \gamma_{\bar{\rho}_1\bar{\rho}_2}^{mn} \right) , \\ (w_3)_{\mu\bar{\nu}, \mu_1\mu_2\bar{\rho}_1\bar{\rho}_2}^i &= \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{imn} \gamma_{\mu_1\mu_2}^m \gamma_{\bar{\rho}_1\bar{\rho}_2}^n , \\ (w_4)_{\mu\bar{\nu}, \mu_1\mu_2\bar{\rho}_1\bar{\rho}_2}^i &= \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{imn} \gamma_{\mu_1\mu_2}^{mk} \gamma_{\bar{\rho}_1\bar{\rho}_2}^{nk} , \end{aligned} \quad (6.8)$$

where the other components of these vectors are obtained from the conditions (4.4), discussed above. Computing the action of S on this basis (6.8) one finds that $\mathcal{M}_{\perp 7}^{-[4]}$ is spanned by

$$\mathcal{M}_{\perp 7}^{-[4]} = \{w_1^i - w_2^i + 4w_3^i\} . \quad (6.9)$$

The dynamical equations are finally obtained according to (3.28) by projecting the image of $M_{\parallel}^{[2]}$ – the latter being entirely given by (5.10) – under T onto the constraint vector (6.9)

$$\left\langle \mathcal{M}_{\perp 7}^{-[4]} \mid \left(T M_{\parallel}^{[2]} - \frac{2}{3} \mathcal{C}^{[4]} \right) \right\rangle .$$

Explicit computation gives the following result

$$\mathcal{D}^m C_{mi} = \frac{1}{2} [Z^m, B_{im}] . \quad (6.10)$$

This gives the analogue of the Yang-Mills equations for the enlarged system associated to the integrable dynamical constraint. For the strong constraint K_{YM} this equation according to (5.12) consistently reproduces the Yang-Mills equations of motion. Moreover, it is compatible with the absence of dynamics in the truncation to the reduced integrable constraint K_{IR} .

Similarly, one may continue with all the other $SO(7)$ subrepresentations contained in $M_{\alpha\beta}$. As is clear from the above proceeding, the existence of a dynamical equation first requires the corresponding subspace $\mathcal{M}_{\perp}$ to be nonempty and in addition a nontrivial projection (3.28) of the image of T . Whereas validity of the first criterion may simply be extracted from the tables collected in appendix C, the second condition requires a more careful calculation and has been done on the computer using Mathematica.

We give the result for this level in linearized order, where the complete set of dynamical equations is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^m Z_m &= 0 , \\ \partial^m C_{mi} &= 0 , \\ \partial_{[i} C_{jk]} &= 0 . \end{aligned} \quad (6.11)$$

The full nonlinear extensions of the first two equations have been given in (6.7), (6.10) above; likewise, the third equation acquires nonlinear contributions, such that the field C_{ij} does not satisfy the pure Bianchi identities of

a covariant field strength. The linearized equations however are sufficient to extract the propagating degrees of freedom contained in Z_i and C_{ij} . E.g. one of the main results of (6.11) is the absence of an equation in the antisymmetric **21** for $\partial_{[i}Z_{j]}$ (although the space $\mathcal{M}_{\perp}^{-} \mathbf{21}$ is nonempty, the projection (3.28) has trivial image). Whereas C_{ij} hence carries the dynamics of a propagating vector field, the role of Z_i remains somewhat unclear.

We close this section with a remark on the dynamical equations for the higher $SO(2,1)$ spin fields at this level. Since the fields appearing in the spectrum of K_{IR} (4.13) remain off-shell, the only dynamical equations of higher spin can appear for the $(\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1})$ fields of level $p=0$ from (4.17). These fields are part of the original Yang-Mills vector field, as such their dynamical equation is expected in the $(\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1})$ at level $p=4$. However, according to (6.2) and (C.5) the space $\mathcal{M}_{\perp}^{- [4]} (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1})$ is empty, such that there is no analogue of this part of the original Yang-Mills equations of motion. The equations (6.11) hence contain the complete dynamical content at this level.

The task of studying the higher superfield levels which might induce higher order equations for the fields Z_i and C_{ij} is left for future work. A strong consistency check for the arising equations is provided by their compatibility with the different truncations (5.12) to the Yang-Mills and the off-shell system, respectively.

7 Summary

In this paper we have analyzed the field content and the dynamical equations induced by certain modifications of the constraint of vanishing super curvature which is equivalent to ten dimensional supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory. The geometric origin of the modified constraints is a truncation of the ten-dimensional linear system, breaking the original Lorentz symmetry $SO(9,1)$ down to $SO(2,1) \times SO(7)$. The Lax representation thereby reduces to a system with scalar spectral parameter (2.23) which bears strong similarity with the Lax connection for selfdual four-dimensional Yang-Mills theory.

Applying the general formalism of section 3, two different scenarios have been revealed for the integrable and the reduced integrable constraint K_{I} and K_{IR} , respectively. The latter induces a spectrum of $(384 + 384)$ fields (4.13) thereby drastically reducing the field content (3.16) of the unconstrained supercurl but still remaining completely off-shell.

The integrable constraint K_I gives rise to additional $(31+16)$ fields which are strongly restricted by first order differential equations which in linearized form have been given in (6.11). The complete spectrum of $SO(2,1)$ singlets thus involves two pairs of fields $(X_i, Z_i$ and $B_{ij}, C_{ij})$ with the same tensorial structure, but with different dimensions, since X_i, B_{ij} , and Z_i, C_{ij} have dimensions one and two, respectively. The fields X_i and B_{ij} do not obey any equations of motion whereas C_{ij} and Z_i appear with dynamical equations coupled to the off-shell fields. According to (6.11), C_{ij} contains the degrees of freedom of a propagating vector field $\tilde{X}_i$, whereas Z_i apparently is associated with an off-shell two-form $\tilde{B}_{ij}$. Hence, we find an intriguing duality with the original fields X_i, B_{ij} which remains to be explored in more detail.

If we reduce to four dimensions, there is a striking analogy with the case of electromagnetism in the presence of magnetic charge (see e.g. ref.[21]), where the field strength is build from two pieces, a homogeneous one such that the Bianchi identity gives zero, and another piece for which the Bianchi identity gives the magnetic current. Thus, we conclude that our dynamics in general involves magnetic charges. On the other hand, the field B_{ij} has the features of a two-form vector potential. An intriguing question is the role of the corresponding gauge transformations $B_{ij} \rightarrow B_{ij} + D_{[i}\Lambda_{j]} + \dots$. However, the form of possible interactions with higher form gauge potentials appears to be highly restricted on general grounds (see [13] for a recent discussion). We leave all these questions to future studies.

Another point we have omitted so far, is the dynamics of the fermionic fields of the theory which may be analyzed with exactly the same methods that have been presented here for the bosonic sector. In particular, the (possibly broken) supersymmetry should help to better understand the nature of the underlying physical system.

In view of the geometric origin of the integrable constraints, a natural problem is the generalization of the present approach by studying more general reductions of the original linear system (2.21). Here, we have analyzed the dynamical systems associated with the particular truncation (2.22) to a one-parameter set of light-like rays whose spatial part spans a two-dimensional plane. Truncation to more general subvarieties may refine the dynamics. Allowing for a more general dependence of the linear system on the vector v^i bears some striking similarities with the harmonic superspace approach to four-dimensional $N=2$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory [6].

We finally mention the possibility to recover in this framework and upon dimensional reduction some of the classical higher spin gauge theories, which have been constructed by Vasiliev (see e.g. [18] for a review) and recently [16] been brought into the context of a possible M-theoretic origin.

Acknowledgements

This work was done in part while one of us (J.-L. G.) was visiting the Physics Department of the University of California at Los Angeles. He is grateful for the warm hospitality, and generous financial support extended to him. The work of H. S. was supported by EU contract ERBFMRX-CT96-0012. Discussions with E. Cremmer, E. D'Hoker, P. Forgacs and K. Stelle have been very useful.

Appendix

A Reduction of σ -matrices.

In this appendix we collect our conventions of $SO(9, 1)$ σ -matrices and their decomposition into $SO(8)$ γ matrices. We use the following particular realization:

$$\begin{aligned} \left((\sigma^9)^{\alpha\beta} \right) &= \left((\sigma^9)_{\alpha\beta} \right) = \begin{pmatrix} -1_{8 \times 8} & 0_{8 \times 8} \\ 0_{8 \times 8} & 1_{8 \times 8} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \left((\sigma^0)^{\alpha\beta} \right) &= - \left((\sigma^0)_{\alpha\beta} \right) = \begin{pmatrix} 1_{8 \times 8} & 0_{8 \times 8} \\ 0_{8 \times 8} & 1_{8 \times 8} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \left((\sigma^i)^{\alpha\beta} \right) &= \left((\sigma^i)_{\alpha\beta} \right) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^i \\ (\gamma^{iT})_{\nu\bar{\mu}} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1, \dots, 8, \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

where $\gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^i$ denote the $SO(8)$ γ -matrices obeying

$$\gamma^i \gamma^j T + \gamma^j \gamma^i T = 2\delta^{ij}, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, 8. \tag{A.2}$$

Our index convention here is as follows: Greek letters from the beginning of the alphabet run from 1 to 16, letters from the middle of the alphabet from 1 to 8, denoting the two spinor representations of $SO(8)$. Choosing

a particular eight-dimensional vector v^i breaks $SO(8)$ down to $SO(7)$ and provides a mapping between the two spinor representations by $\gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{\vec{v}} = v^i \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^i$. For notational convenience we put $v^i = \delta_8^i$ and $\gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^8 = \delta_{\mu\bar{\nu}}$, such that $\mu \leftrightarrow \bar{\mu}$ denotes an $SO(7)$ covariant involution. It then follows from the Dirac algebra (A.2) that the matrices γ^i , $i = 1, \dots, 7$ are antisymmetric. In the main text, unless otherwise stated, Roman indices $i, j, \dots$ from the middle of the alphabet exclusively denote the coordinates $1, \dots, 7$.

To make the $SO(2, 1)$ covariance of the decomposition (A.1) manifest, we define the action of the generators δ_k , $k = -1, 0, 1$ on the supercurl $M_{\alpha\beta}$ as:

$$\delta_k M_{\alpha\beta} = (J_k M + M J_k^T)_{\alpha\beta} + \theta^{\alpha'} (J_k)_{\alpha'\beta'} \partial_{\beta'} M_{\alpha\beta} , \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$\text{with } J_0 = \sigma^0 \sigma^9 , \quad J_{\pm 1} = \frac{1}{2} \sigma^8 \sigma^{\pm} .$$

B The $O(9, 1)$ characters.

In this appendix, we compute the characters of the reducible representations which appear in section 3. The path followed is similar to the calculation of string characters of ref.[5], and we shall refer to that paper for details. In general, the $O(9, 1)$ characters are defined as $\chi(\vec{v}) = \text{Tr} (e^{\sum_i v_i \mathcal{H}_i})$, where v_i are arbitrary parameters, where the trace is taken in the representation considered, and $\mathcal{H}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, 5$ are a set of five commuting elements of the Lie algebra. Using a parametrization analogous to the one used in ref.[5] for $O(8)$ spinors, one easily sees for instance that the character of the **16** representation⁷ is given by

$$\chi_{\mathbf{16}}(\vec{v}) = \sum_{\substack{\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_5 = \pm 1 \\ \text{odd } \# = 1}} \prod_i e^{\frac{1}{2} v_i \epsilon_i} . \quad (\text{B.1})$$

B.1 The unconstrained character.

In this subsection, we first compute the character associated with the representation span by the full $M_{\alpha\beta}$, by considering the trace over the full space

⁷In this appendix boldface dimensions refer to $O(9, 1)$ representations

$\mathcal{M}$. The $\alpha\beta$ indices then contribute a factor

$$\chi_{\underbrace{16 \otimes 16}_s}(\vec{v}) = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \left[\sum_{\substack{\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_5 = \pm 1 \\ \text{odd } \# = 1}} \prod_i e^{\frac{1}{2} v_i \epsilon_i} \right]^2 + \sum_{\substack{\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_5 = \pm 1 \\ \text{odd } \# = 1}} \prod_i e^{\frac{1}{2} 2 v_i \epsilon_i} \right\}$$

Concerning the θ part, one works in an occupation number basis where $N_\alpha = \theta^\alpha \partial_\alpha$ is simultaneously diagonal for $\alpha = 1, \dots, 16$. Since the Lie group generators commute with the grading operator $\mathcal{R}$, it is convenient to introduce in general characters of the type $\chi(\vec{v}|q) = \text{Tr} (q^{\mathcal{R}} e^{\sum_i v_i \mathcal{H}_i})$. Then the calculations becomes identical to a part of the string calculation, where the role of $\mathcal{R}$ is played by the Virasoro generator L_0 . Altogether, one finds that the character without any constraint denoted χ_u is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_u(\vec{v}|q) &= \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \left[\sum_{\substack{\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_5 = \pm 1 \\ \text{odd } \# = 1}} \prod_i e^{\frac{1}{2} v_i \epsilon_i} \right]^2 + \sum_{\substack{\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_5 = \pm 1 \\ \text{odd } \# = 1}} \prod_i e^{\frac{1}{2} 2 v_i \epsilon_i} \right\} \times \\ &\times \prod_{\substack{\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_5 = \pm 1 \\ \text{odd } \# = 1}} \left(1 + q \prod_i e^{\frac{1}{2} v_i \epsilon_i} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

B.2 The character corresponding to $\mathcal{M}^\pm$.

To determine them, we first compute the character with S introduced. This is straightforward since S is a group invariant. Using again the occupation numbers operators $N_\alpha = \theta^\alpha \partial_\alpha$, one may verify that

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_S(\vec{v}|q) &\equiv \text{Tr} \left(e^{\sum_{i=1}^5 v_i \mathcal{H}_i} S \right) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\alpha, \beta \\ s}} \text{Tr}_\theta \left\{ q^{\sum_\gamma N_\gamma} \prod_i (e^{v_i \mathcal{H}_i})_{\alpha, \beta; \alpha, \beta} e^{v_i \sum_\rho (\mathcal{H}_i)^\rho_\rho N_\rho} (N_\alpha + N_\beta) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

where the trace over $\alpha\beta$ only involves the symmetric states. After some straightforward computation one finds that

$$2\chi_u(\vec{v}|q) - \chi_S(\vec{v}|q) = \sum_{\{\epsilon\}\{\epsilon'\}} \prod_i e^{\frac{1}{2} v_i (\epsilon_i + \epsilon'_i)} \prod_{\{\eta\} \neq \{\epsilon\}} \left(1 + q \prod_i e^{\frac{1}{2} v_i \eta_i} \right)$$

$$+ \sum_{\{\epsilon\}} \prod_i e^{v_i(\epsilon_i)} \prod_{\{\eta\} \neq \{\epsilon\}} \left(1 + q \prod_i e^{\frac{1}{2} v_i \eta_i} \right) \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Clearly,

$$2\chi_u - \chi_S \equiv \text{Tr} \left((S-2) q^{\mathcal{R}} \prod_i e^{v_i \mathcal{H}_i} \right) = \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{M}^+} \left((\mathcal{R}+2) q^{\mathcal{R}} \prod_i e^{v_i \mathcal{H}_i} \right).$$

An easy computation then gives

$$\chi^+ (\vec{v}|q) \equiv \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{M}^+} \left(q^{\mathcal{R}} \prod_i e^{v_i \mathcal{H}_i} \right) = q^{-2} \int_0^q dx x \{ 2\chi_u (\vec{v}|x) - \chi_S (\vec{v}|x) \} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \chi^+ (\vec{v}|q) &= \sum_{p=0}^{14} q^p (p+1) \sum_{\{\eta_1\} < \{\eta_2\} < \dots < \{\eta_{p+2}\}} e^{\frac{1}{2} \vec{v} \cdot (\sum_{r=1}^{p+2} \vec{\eta}_r)} \\ &+ \sum_{p=0}^{15} q^p \sum_{\{\epsilon\} \neq \{\eta_1\} < \{\eta_2\} < \dots < \{\eta_p\}} e^{\frac{1}{2} \vec{v} \cdot (\sum_{r=1}^p \vec{\eta}_r + 2\vec{\epsilon})}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

where all summations over η and ϵ are understood with an odd total number of positive sign, respectively. Of course the dimensions are derived from the particular case where $\vec{v} = 0$. One may verify in this way formulae given in the main text, as well as derive others. In particular,

$$\dim \mathcal{M}^+ = 16 (2^{17} - 1) - 17 (2^{16} - 1) = 983041 \quad (\text{B.7})$$

It would be interesting to derive the characters $\chi_{\parallel}^+$, and $\chi_{\perp}^-$ which determine the physical field content, and the set of field equations. This is much harder, since K_I and K_{IR} break $O(9, 1)$ invariance. It is left for further studies.

C Group decomposition of superfields.

In this appendix we give the decomposition of the lowest levels of the space of superfields

$$\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_{\parallel} + \mathcal{M}_{\perp} = \mathcal{M}^+ + \mathcal{M}^-, \quad (\text{C.1})$$

with respect to $SO(9, 1)$ and $SO(2, 1) \times SO(7)$, respectively.

At level $p = 2$ with $\mathcal{M}_{\parallel}$, $\mathcal{M}_{\perp}$ defined by the strong constraint K_{YM} from (2.15) we find the following $SO(9, 1)$ multiplicities

$SO(9, 1)$ mult.	45	210	945	1050	5940	6930
$\mathcal{M}$	2	2	2	1	1	1
$\mathcal{M}_{\parallel}$	1	1	1			
$\mathcal{M}_{\perp}$	1	1	1	1	1	1
$\mathcal{M}^+$	1	1	1		1	
$\mathcal{M}^-$	1	1	1	1		1

(C.2)

For the integrable constraint (3.22) this table takes the form – now in terms of representations of $SO(2, 1) \times SO(7)$

$\mathcal{M}$	$4 \cdot (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1})$	$2 \cdot (\mathbf{5}, \mathbf{7})$ $5 \cdot (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{7})$ $4 \cdot (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{7})$	$3 \cdot (\mathbf{5}, \mathbf{21})$ $6 \cdot (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{21})$ $6 \cdot (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{21})$	$3 \cdot (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{27})$	$2 \cdot (\mathbf{5}, \mathbf{35})$ $8 \cdot (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{35})$ $4 \cdot (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{35})$	...
$\mathcal{M}_{\parallel}$	$3 \cdot (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1})$	$1 \cdot (\mathbf{5}, \mathbf{7})$ $3 \cdot (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{7})$ $3 \cdot (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{7})$	$1 \cdot (\mathbf{5}, \mathbf{21})$ $3 \cdot (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{21})$ $4 \cdot (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{21})$	$2 \cdot (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{27})$	$4 \cdot (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{35})$ $2 \cdot (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{35})$	...
$\mathcal{M}_{\perp}$	$1 \cdot (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1})$	$1 \cdot (\mathbf{5}, \mathbf{7})$ $2 \cdot (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{7})$ $1 \cdot (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{7})$	$2 \cdot (\mathbf{5}, \mathbf{21})$ $3 \cdot (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{21})$ $2 \cdot (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{21})$	$1 \cdot (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{27})$	$2 \cdot (\mathbf{5}, \mathbf{35})$ $4 \cdot (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{35})$ $2 \cdot (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{35})$	...
$\mathcal{M}^+$	$2 \cdot (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1})$	$1 \cdot (\mathbf{5}, \mathbf{7})$ $3 \cdot (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{7})$ $2 \cdot (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{7})$	$2 \cdot (\mathbf{5}, \mathbf{21})$ $3 \cdot (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{21})$ $3 \cdot (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{21})$	$2 \cdot (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{27})$	$1 \cdot (\mathbf{5}, \mathbf{35})$ $4 \cdot (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{35})$ $2 \cdot (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{35})$	...
$\mathcal{M}^-$	$2 \cdot (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1})$	$1 \cdot (\mathbf{5}, \mathbf{7})$ $2 \cdot (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{7})$ $2 \cdot (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{7})$	$1 \cdot (\mathbf{5}, \mathbf{21})$ $3 \cdot (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{21})$ $3 \cdot (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{21})$	$1 \cdot (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{27})$	$1 \cdot (\mathbf{5}, \mathbf{35})$ $4 \cdot (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{35})$ $2 \cdot (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{35})$	...

(C.3)

The multiplicities of $\mathcal{M}_{\parallel}$, $\mathcal{M}_{\perp}$ here are determined by computing the decomposition of tensor products

$$(\mathbf{8} \times \mathbf{8})_s \times (\mathbf{8} \times \mathbf{8} \times \dots \times \mathbf{8})_a \times (\mathbf{8} \times \mathbf{8} \times \dots \times \mathbf{8})_a, \quad \text{etc. ;}$$

To obtain the multiplicities of $\mathcal{M}^{\pm}$ one needs in addition the decomposition of the Young diagrams (3.10). This has been done with the help of LiE [17].

At level $p = 4$ we find with the strong constraint (2.15) the following multiplicities of the lowest dimensional $SO(9, 1)$ representations

$SO(9, 1)$ mult.	10	120	126	$\overline{126}$	320	...
$\mathcal{M}$	1	1	1	2	2	...
$\mathcal{M}_{\parallel}$				1	1	...
$\mathcal{M}_{\perp}$	1	1	1	1	1	...
$\mathcal{M}^{+}$				1	1	...
$\mathcal{M}^{-}$	1	1	1	1	1	...

(C.4)

whereas the integrable constraint (3.22) implies the decomposition

$\mathcal{M}$	2·(7, 1) 4·(5, 1) 8·(3, 1) 1·(1, 1)	2·(7, 7) 11·(5, 7) 13·(3, 7) 9·(1, 7)	2·(7, 21) 15·(5, 21) 19·(3, 21) 14·(1, 21)	2·(7, 27) 7·(5, 27) 13·(3, 27) 5·(1, 27)	5·(7, 35) 15·(5, 35) 28·(3, 35) 10·(1, 35)	...
$\mathcal{M}_{\parallel}$	1·(7, 1) 2·(5, 1) 5·(3, 1)	1·(7, 7) 6·(5, 7) 7·(3, 7) 5·(1, 7)	7·(5, 21) 9·(3, 21) 8·(1, 21)	1·(7, 27) 3·(5, 27) 7·(3, 27) 2·(1, 27)	1·(7, 35) 5·(5, 35) 13·(3, 35) 4·(1, 35)	...
$\mathcal{M}_{\perp}$	1·(7, 1) 2·(5, 1) 3·(3, 1) 1·(1, 1)	1·(7, 7) 5·(5, 7) 6·(3, 7) 4·(1, 7)	2·(7, 21) 8·(5, 21) 9·(3, 21) 6·(1, 21)	1·(7, 27) 4·(5, 27) 6·(3, 27) 3·(1, 27)	4·(7, 35) 10·(5, 35) 15·(3, 35) 6·(1, 35)	...
$\mathcal{M}^{+}$	1·(7, 1) 2·(5, 1) 3·(3, 1)	1·(7, 7) 5·(5, 7) 5·(3, 7) 3·(1, 7)	1·(7, 21) 6·(5, 21) 7·(3, 21) 5·(1, 21)	1·(7, 27) 3·(5, 27) 5·(3, 27) 2·(1, 27)	2·(7, 35) 6·(5, 35) 10·(3, 35) 3·(1, 35)	...
$\mathcal{M}^{-}$	1·(7, 1) 2·(5, 1) 5·(3, 1) 1·(1, 1)	1·(7, 7) 6·(5, 7) 8·(3, 7) 6·(1, 7)	1·(7, 21) 9·(5, 21) 12·(3, 21) 9·(1, 21)	1·(7, 27) 4·(5, 27) 8·(3, 27) 3·(1, 27)	3·(7, 35) 9·(5, 35) 18·(3, 35) 7·(1, 35)	...

(C.5)

References

- [1] Abdalla, E., Forger, M., Jacques, M.: Higher conservation laws for ten-dimensional supersymmetric Yang-Mills theories. Nucl. Phys. **B307**, 198 (1988)
- [2] Belavin, A. A., Zakharov, V. E.: Yang-Mills equations as inverse scattering problem. Phys. Lett. **B73**, 53 (1978)
- [3] Bergshoeff, E., de Roo, M.: The supercurrent in ten-dimensions. Phys. Lett. **B112**, 53 (1982)
- [4] Chau, L.-L., Milewski, B.: Linear system and conservation laws for $d = 10$ super-Yang-Mills. Phys. Lett. **B198**, 356–358 (1987)
- [5] Cremmer, E., Gervais, J.-L.: T duality of perturbative characters for closed bosonic and type II string theories. Nucl. Phys. **B509**, 83 (1998)
- [6] Galperin, A., Ivanov, E., Kalitsyn, S., Ogievetsky, V., Sokatchev, E.: Unconstrained $N = 2$ matter, Yang-Mills and supergravity theories in harmonic superspace. Class. Quant. Grav. **1**, 469 (1984)
- [7] Gervais, J.-L.: Baecklund transformations in 10D SUSY Yang-Mills theories (with a preamble on the birth of supersymmetry). In: Shifman, M. (ed.), *Many Faces of Superworld, Yuri Golfand Memorial Volume*. World Scientific, 1999
- [8] Gervais, J.-L.: Lax equations in ten-dimensional supersymmetric classical Yang-Mills theories. Contribution to the International Seminar on Integrable Systems, in memoriam of Mikhail V. Saveliev, Max-Planck Institute for Mathematics, Bonn (1999)
- [9] Gervais, J.-L.: Solution generating in ten dimensional supersymmetric classical Yang-Mills theories. Contribution to the Dubna Memorial Volume in honor of Mikhail V. Saveliev. (1999)
- [10] Gervais, J.-L., Saveliev, M.: Progress in classically solving ten-dimensional supersymmetric reduced Yang-Mills theories. Nucl. Phys. **B554**, 183 (1999)

- [11] Harnad, J., Hurtubise, J., Legare, M., Shnider, S.: Constraint equations and field equations in supersymmetric $n = 3$ Yang-Mills theory. Nucl. Phys. **B256**, 609 (1985)
- [12] Harnad, J., Shnider, S.: Constraints and field equations for ten-dimensional super Yang-Mills theory. Commun. Math. Phys. **106**, 183 (1986)
- [13] Knaepen, B.: Local BRST cohomology for p -form gauge theories. PhD thesis (1999)
- [14] Nilsson, B. E. W.: Off-shell fields for the ten-dimensional supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory (1981). Preprint GOTEBORG-81-6, unpublished
- [15] S. J. Gates, J., Stelle, K. S., West, P. C.: Algebraic origins of superspace constraints in supergravity. Nucl. Phys. **B169**, 347 (1980)
- [16] Sezgin, E., Sundell, P.: Higher spin $N = 8$ supergravity. JHEP **11**, 016 (1998)
- [17] van Leeuwen, M., Cohen, A., Lisser, B.: LiE, a computer algebra package for Lie group computations. Computer Algebra Nederland, Amsterdam (1992)
- [18] Vasiliev, M. A.: Higher-spin gauge theories in four, three and two dimensions. Int. J. Mod. Phys. **D5**, 763 (1996)
- [19] Witten, E.: Twistor - like transform in ten-dimensions. Nucl. Phys. **B266**, 245 (1986)
- [20] Zumino, B.: Cohomology of gauge groups: Cocycles and Schwinger terms. Nucl. Phys. **B253**, 477 (1985)
- [21] Zwanziger, D.: Local Lagrangian quantum field theory of electric and magnetic charges. Phys. Rev. **D3**, 880 (1971)